


THE J. PAUL GETTY MUSEUM JOURNAL I



VISIT...

LANZAROTE
Caliente.COM

**THE J. PAUL GETTY MUSEUM JOURNAL
VOLUME I**

1974

**The J. Paul Getty Museum
Malibu, California**

Volume I
Jiří Frel, Editor

Published by the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, California
© 1975 The J. Paul Getty Museum
All rights reserved
ISBN 0-89236-000-3

Produced in Chicago by Ares Publishers, Inc.

Abbreviation: Getty M.J.

In 1974, when The Museum was reopened in the new building, Mr. Getty authorized the publication of the *Journal* on a regular basis. The *Journal* publishes mainly papers concerning works of art from The Museum's three collections—Greek and Roman antiquities, European paintings, and French decorative arts. The editorship will be assumed by the three curators in turn. The first two issues deal solely with antiquities and are intended as a tribute to Bernard Ashmole.

Editor

BERNARDO ASHMOLE OCTOGENARIO
DE MUSEO GETTIANO BENEMERENTI


PARS PRIMA

Contents

Introduction	5
<i>The Kleophrades Painter's Cup in London,</i> John Boardman	7
<i>Two Bronze Hydriai in Malibu,</i> Dietrich von Bothmer	15
<i>Identification of Skeletal Material Found in a Greek Hydria,</i> Rainer Berger and Reiner Protsch	23
<i>A Fourth-Century Funerary Stele in the J. Paul Getty Museum,</i> Joseph Breslin	25
<i>A Set of Archaic Greek Jewelry,</i> Elizabeth Trimble Buckley	27
<i>Two Medusa-Head Friezes,</i> Brian F. Cook	33
<i>Neue Demosthenes-Bildnisse,</i> Erna Diez	37
<i>Nikosthenic Amphorai,</i> Michael M. Eisman	43
<i>A Hermes by Kalamis and Some Other Sculptures,</i> Jiří Frel	55
<i>Two Roman Portrait Reliefs,</i> Elaine K. Gazda	61
<i>The Arundel "Homerus" Rediscovered,</i> Denys Haynes	73
<i>Apollo by Kephisodotos the Elder,</i> Dorothy Kent Hill	81
<i>Unpublished Apulian Rhyta,</i> Selma Holo	85
<i>Daredevil Divinities?</i> R. G. Hood	95
<i>Primitive Rock Engravings from Crete,</i> Sinclair Hood	101

Introduction

Bernard Ashmole, one of the greatest connoisseurs of ancient sculpture, after a fine career with the British Museum and at Oxford University, has spent the last five years helping us form the antiquities collection at the J. Paul Getty Museum. Thanks to him the quality of our collection has been maintained.



J. PAUL GETTY

This page intentionally left blank

The Kleophrades Painter's Cup in London

The Kleophrades Painter has been unlucky in the survival of his cups. The two fine early specimens in the Cabinet des Médailles (ARV 191, nos. 103, 104) are sadly fragmentary. Of the three late cups the Acropolis fragments with the preparations of the Seven against Thebes (no. 105) are badly rubbed, and the Bologna cup (no. 107) with the Theseus cycle is heavily restored in its present state¹ and at any rate his latest and far from best work. The third late cup (no. 106), in London, lacks nearly half the fragments from its figure scenes and all its foot but, except in the tondo, the missing pieces are the less important. It has been published in an old drawing and scattered, comparatively small photographs.² It deserves better, and the new photographs taken for this occasion, with my commentary upon them, are offered to Bernard Ashmole as a former Keeper of the collection in which the cup is housed, as a scholar who has enhanced our understanding of the many aspects of Classical art, and as a man to whom the writer owes much on many counts.

The painter's early cups were giants, some half a metre across.³ The later cups are of standard size, this one with a diameter of 32 cm.⁴ It was found at Kameiros in Rhodes in a tomb with vases and terracottas mainly of the second half of the fifth century.⁵ It must have been long treasured before burial. And there was good reason for treasuring it. It is one of those rare Archaic cups with a frieze of figures around its tondo, a scheme more common in black figure than red figure.⁶ Although a late work, it sparkles with relief line contour and detail. The use of thinned paint is comparatively modest⁷ but there is a lot of colour—red for the baldrics, the blood, the tasselled fillets, the lavish inscriptions for every figure;⁸ white for the hair and beards of the venerable sea deities on the interior frieze, and on Thetis' diadem. The white is laid on thick. The diadem is tricked out

with flowers and its band carries a chequer which seems to have been made by scratching away the patches in the white. On Nereus' hair the red of the fillet was deliberately spread over the back of the head and on the locks tied up behind—a motley effect. The painter of power, whom we remember for his large, dramatic figures, shows himself still a painter of delicacy. Beazley finds the right words—"the effect of the vase is jewel-like".⁹

We look first at the subsidiary decoration. The palmette complex at the handles is uncommon and chiefly remarkable for the form of the 'lyre pattern' at the centre.¹⁰ The stopt maeander and crosses in squares used as a ground line and as tondo border is not a regular pattern on the artist's other vases,¹¹ but is seen on his Bologna cup¹² (for the tondo border) and is common on cups by other painters (as in the circle of the Brygos Painter and some Douris).

Side A (Fig. 7) has Herakles killing Kyknos. Of Athena, who stands behind Herakles, we see only the lower part of her chiton and himation, a foot and part of the spear she is holding upright (we might restore the rest of her figure from side B). Herakles (fig. 6), wide-eyed, storms forward over his victim almost as if to leap over him to reach his next quarry, Ares. His spear sinks into Kyknos' neck and his left arm stretches behind the stricken figure, holding a shield of heroic Boeotian shape with palmette mounts for its *porpax*. The hero wears his lionskin knotted at his neck and tightly belted over a short chiton.

Kyknos is collapsing away from his opponent, his head jolted back at the impact of the spear, his grip already limp on the *antilabe* of his round hoplite shield. He is wounded already in armpit and thigh where the red blood flows, he has lost his sword and his raised right hand grasps still his spear which he has broken, it seems, on Herakles' shield or invulnerable lionskin.

1) See ARV 1632.

2) London, British Museum E 73 (64.10-7.1685). The original line drawings were published by P. Gardner in *Journal of Philology* vii (1877) 215ff., pls. A, B and were copied in C. Robert, *Scenen der Ilias* (1891) 10, fig. 15 (side B); in K. Bulas, *Les illustrations antiques de l'Iliade* (1929) 35, fig. 19 (side B); in K. F. Johansen, *Iliaden i tidlig graesk Kunst* (1934) fig. 36 and *The Iliad in Early Greek Art* (1967) 205, fig. 85 (side B). Johansen, *ibid.*, fig. 84, has a photograph of side B and there is a detail of side A in J. D. Beazley, *Der Kleophrades-Maler* (1933) pl. 32.1 (= *The Kleophrades Painter* [1974] pl. 32.1). J. M. Hemelrijk has a photograph of the interior in *BABesch* xlviii (1973) 178, fig. 6 and P. Jacobsthal the handle palmettes in *OGV* pl. 86a. C. H. Smith gives a full description in *BMC Vases* iii (1896) 97-9, with other early references, and see Beazley, *op. cit.*, 21, no. 94, and *JHS* xxx (1910) 63 f. I am indebted to Dr. Ann Birchall for having new photographs taken and giving me the opportunity to study it, and to Denys Haynes and the Trustees of the British Museum for permission to publish it.

3) Beazley, *op. cit.*, 10.

4) Bloesch (*Formen attischer Schalen* 137, no. 4) attributes it to his Eleusis Group commenting on the articulation of the lip inside only,

uncommon on stemmed cups. The present foot is modern.

5) For the group see R. A. Higgins, *BMC Terracottas* i, 26.

6) See K. Schauenburg in *Studien zur griechischen Vasenmalerei* (AK Beiheft vii, 1970) 33ff. for black figure (36f., for red figure).

7) Brown stripes outline Herakles' lionskin on A and appear on the rock on B. The sinews on limbs are marked on A (not B) and on Thetis' arm, and lines on Athena's sleeve (B) and Kymo's dress (interior)—up and down and converging on each breast. There is brown on the hair rolls of the Nereids and for moustaches.

8) Where there is a notable diversity of letter forms. Etais are broad or thin; deltas equilateral or right-angled; some upsilons are tailed; alphas have a low-angled cross bar or are narrow with a high, horizontal cross bar. The rhos are rounded; sigmas four-barred; omegas flat.

9) *JHS* xxx (1910) 64.

10) On which see Jacobsthal, *OGV* 129.

11) On the Acropolis cup the artist has three meander-units, stopt or running stopt, divided by chequered squares, around the tondo (ACR. 336, pl. 25).

12) The Bologna cup (PU 270; ARV 192, no. 107; CVA Bologna v, pls. 111-12) is one of the links with the Boot Painter, whom Beazley con-

Behind him, too late, Ares is poised, spear raised, shield held high and shown in near-profile with half the bull's head blazon visible. Both Ares and Kyknos wear Corinthian helmets with low crests pushed back on their heads, linen corselets over short chitons and greaves. Ares' scabbard is a fine thing, decorated with a snake twined about its length, its head turned back just below the hilt. We might imagine it to be of gold wrapped onto the scabbard like a woman's bracelet. Our artist loves details of armour like this, and we see the snake scabbard again for the fateful sword which Ajax has received from Hector in the exchange of gifts shown on the Würzburg amphora,¹³ the sword with which Ajax is later to kill himself; and on the less practical *kopis* scabbard worn by Neoptolemos as he strikes down Priam on the Vivenzio hydria.¹⁴ We might also recall the little snake painted on the top back of the corselet of one of the Seven on the cup from the Acropolis.¹⁵

The principal figures are labelled—ΗΡΑΚΛΕΟΣ, ΚΥΚΝΟΣ, ΑΦΗΣ. (Athena also, no doubt, but the inscription is missing, with most of the goddess.)

The story of Herakles' fight with Kyknos and subsequent wounding of Ares was told in the Hesiodic *Shield of Herakles* and Stesichoros' *Kyknos*.¹⁶ The little we know of the latter—notably a preliminary encounter where Herakles flees before Kyknos and Ares¹⁷—does not relate to the vase scenes directly, so we cannot judge whether it influenced or inspired any of them. The vase scenes begin little before 550.¹⁸ The temple shown on a Corinthian fragment must refer to the sanctuary of Apollo where the fight took place.¹⁹ On the Athenian vases Athena is prominent, as she is also in the *Shield* but in that poem Herakles is equipped with a fine helmet (*Il.* 136-8), as never on the vases where he wears his lionskin. This may be either because the poem was written before artists and other poets had given the hero the skin (in about the 570's) or because the artistic convention overruled the text. However, on vases Zeus is regularly shown intervening (or, on Late Archaic, his thunderbolt alone) and this may refer to yet another early variant of the story recorded in literature only much later (Apollodoros ii, 5.11). The early vase scenes, at

any rate, need not depend on any particular text, but when we come to an artist like the Kleophrades Painter, even dealing with a stock scene, we may ask whether he is not refreshing the standard group in some way. If so, it is on the basis of the *Shield*. Here (*Il.* 413-5) Kyknos fails to pierce Herakles' divine shield with his spear, and on the vase his broken spear is a very prominent feature;²⁰ and in the poem the fatal blow is struck exactly as on the vase

μεσσηγὺς κόρυθός τε καὶ ἀσπίδος ἔγχεϊ μακρῷ αὐχένα
γυμνωθέντα δοῶς ὑπένεργε γενείου
ἦλ' ἀσ' ἐπικρατέω·

(*Il.* 417-9).

This is by no means a common thrust in red figure battle scenes. And Zeus is missing. It is at least possible that the Kleophrades Painter is taking a more literary view of the event than most other vase painters of his day.

Side B (fig. 8) shows Aphrodite rescuing Aeneas from Diomedes, who is supported by Athena: the episode of *Iliad* v, 299ff. Athena stands at the left wearing himation over chiton, a low-crested Attic helmet, and holding a hoplite shield and upright spear. Before her Diomedes rushes forward, his shield arm extended, his sword arm lowered for a final thrust at Aeneas who has collapsed onto his knees, his eyes rolling up, head sinking onto his chest (fig. 5)—very like the Kyknos on side A. He has been struck in the chest by a spear which remains embedded, its shaft broken. He raises his right arm behind his head, not clasping a spear still, as Kyknos, for he has lost his weapons, but against the rock which lowers towards him from beyond Diomedes' shield. Aphrodite is trying to drag him out of danger, supporting him with one hand beneath his armpit, the other on his upper arm. She is rather overdressed for the battlefield with sakkos and earring, chiton, and himation which flies from her arms as she turns to escape with her son. Her glance is towards the sword which threatens them both. The figures are labelled—ΑΘΗΝΑΙΑ, ΔΙΟΜΗΔΕΣ, ΑΦΡΟΔΙΤΗΣ, ΑΙΝΕΑΣ.

When Gardner published the cup in 1877 he confessed to wondering at first whether the rock was the cloud

sidered might be a late phase of the Kleophrades Painter (ARV 820); another link is the London hydria with girls washing (ARV 189, no. 77; *JHS* xxx [1910] pl. 3), more for subject and detail than style. The Boot Painter sometimes uses a similar meander and squares pattern to that on our cup.

13) Würzburg 508; ARV 182, no. 5; and see now *AK* xvi (1973) pl. 11.2,3.

14) Naples 2422; ARV 189, no. 74; the detail is clear in Arias-Hirmer, *History of Greek Vase Painting* pl. 125 above. The oblique strokes on many other scabbards may be inspired by such ornament. Compare especially that worn by Neoptolemos killing Priam on the Brygos Painter cup, *ibid.*, pl. 139 above.

15) Acr. 336; ARV 192, no. 105; Beazley, *op. cit.*, pl. 32.2.

16) For this see, conveniently, C. M. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (1961) 79-81, 122f., and, on the *Shield*, G. L. Huxley, *Greek Epic Poetry* (1969) 110f.

17) Alluded to by Pindar, *Ol.* x, 15-6 (476 B.C.).

18) Fully discussed by F. Vian in *REA* xlvii (1945) 5ff. and see S. Karouzou in *BCH* lxxix (1955) 177ff. (=Coll. *Stathatou* iii, 137ff.) and F. Brommer, *Vasenlisten*² 79ff.

19) H. Payne, *Necrocorinthia* 131f., fig. 45 bis. It is certainly not Kyknos' temple of skulls (*pace* Bowra, 122).

20) See also the broken spear on side B and as a feature of duels of Achilles and Hector, Johansen, *op. cit.*, 216.

in which, later, Aphrodite was to escape after being wounded by Diomedes (*Iliad* v, 344-6), and declined to recognise any rock. Smith, in his 1896 catalogue, described it properly and some later commentators seem to have ignored or mistaken it.²¹ It is clear, however, that a rock is meant, and its towering form resembles similar landscape elements on Greek vases.²² This missile, however, probably did not reach the ground line of the scene. Greek vase painters are exempt from observation of the laws of physics or space/time and the rock shown us in this way is simply a reminder that Aeneas has been struck down by Diomedes with it (as *Iliad* v, 302-10) and the Greek is now moving in for the kill. (The spear thrust is superfluous to the story.) A similar though smaller rock is shown in exactly the same relative position on Douris' Paris cup showing the duel between Ajax and Hector, also with regard to the *Iliad* (vii, 268-72).²³ In the few extant vase scenes of the duel of Diomedes and Aeneas only the Kleophrades Painter is so true to the text.

The interior (fig. 1) of the cup is decorated with a tondo and outer frieze. In the tondo Peleus wrestles with Thetis. The hero is wholly missing but for part of his name, to the left of the altar: ΠΗΛΕΪΥΣ. Of Thetis, who is labelled (ΘΗΤΙΣ) we have head, arms and part of her skirt and foot. She is wearing a chiton with a himation draped across her shoulders. Her right arm is bent down towards Peleus, and with her left hand she lifts her long back hair which is tied up with a fillet and further adorned with a floral diadem (fig. 2). The gesture is presumably one of distress.²⁴ She is pacing away to the right over a plain ground area. At the left is part of the spotted body of a snake, one of her mutations. At the right is an altar, missing its corner scroll, with a tongue (meant for ovolo) moulding at its top. On it is a *ketos* with scaly body, beaded body stripe and fin. Its tail, running into the border, is truncated. Its head can be restored with pointed muzzle but all we have is the spiny ruff. The monster is her familiar and later fights for her. It is seen in this context from the late sixth century on—a good contemporary version appears on a stamnos by the Tyszkiewicz Painter.²⁵

The outer frieze runs within the offset lip. It is occupied by six of Thetis' startled companions who are run-

ning to their father and to Triton. Nereus (fig. 3), with curly white beard and piebald hair caught up behind in a red fillet, is seated on a chair over which a patterned cloth with clipped border has been spread, and before which is a low foot rest. He is wearing chiton and himation, supports a flower-tipped sceptre on his right shoulder with his right hand and holds a dolphin in his left. Triton holds a similar sceptre and dolphin and is white-haired but his locks flow freely at his neck. Over his human torso he wears a mini-peplos and we see part only of his scaly body, belly and fin. Both deities are labelled: ΝΗΡΕΥΣ, ΤΡΙΤΩΝ. Towards them run three Nereids. The one between them is named ΚΥΜΑΘΕΑ. She is dressed in chiton and himation, stretches out her right hand and lifts her back hair with her left. The gesture is as Thetis' and her hair is similarly dressed but with a simpler, notched diadem. Of the two before Nereus we have the outstretched right hand and chiton skirt and legs of one, and the outstretched left hand and one foot of another, named ΓΑΛΕΝΗ, who may have been looking round. Behind her run three more Nereids, but in the opposite direction, to behind Triton. In the lead is ΓΑΥΚΗ (for Glauke), of whom we have only the head and hair, dressed like Kymathea. Behind her runs ΚΥΜΩ whose features are missing but whose hair was clearly more carefully dressed. She holds her himation out in each hand and wears an elaborate chiton with patterned border. The last is ΠΑΣΙΘΕΑ whose head and shoulder we see, with part of her chiton and himation. Her hair is caught up in a fillet with a diadem like Kymathea's.

This is one of the fullest versions of the episode, lacking only Nereus' wife Doris and Chiron who had advised Peleus how to fight the versatile Thetis. But the Kleophrades Painter has the scene also on a fragmentary volute crater in Paris and Geneva, where Chiron does appear, with Nereus, Doris and Nereids.²⁶ The version of the 'courtship' of Peleus and Thetis which involves the fight is possibly not one known to the *Kypria* and Hesiod, where the marriage is 'arranged' and the principal theme is the wedding and assembly of gods at the feast, where the dire challenge leading to the Trojan War was made.²⁷

21) As, apparently, by Beazley in *Boston Vases* ii, 19 and Johansen, op. cit., 206. Both Beazley and Johansen discuss other representations of the encounter in detail. Bulas and Robert (the first) observe the rock.

22) Compare the cliffs on the Kleophrades Painter's Theseus cup in Bologna (see note 12).

23) Paris G 115; ARV 434, no. 74; Johansen, op. cit., 208-12, fig. 88. This is more Archaic in appearance than our cup but probably no earlier.

24) On the Berlin Painter stamnos, Munich 8738 (ARV 209, no. 161),

CVA v, pl. 260.1, she holds the end of her fillet in the same manner.

25) Worcester (Mass.) 1953.92; ARV 291, no. 26. For a fighting *ketos* see the Marsyas Painter's pelike, London E 424; ARV 1475, no. 4; Arias-Hirmer, op. cit., pl. xlvii.

26) ARV 186, no. 51; A. Greifenhagen, *Neue Fragmente des Kleophrades-Malers* (1972) pls. 15-19; only part of the grappling pair, with one snake, is preserved. For the subject on vases see B. Graef, *JdI* i (1886) 192ff.; J. M. Hemelrijk, *BABesch* xlviii (1973) 180f.

27) A. Lesky, *Gesammelten Schriften* (1966) 401ff.



1 Cup by Kleophrades Painter. British Museum CX-C.49. Inside



2,3,4 Details from inside



5 Detail from B



6 Herakles from A

On the cup Nereus is in his normal state for this period, a venerable elder. In the sixth century he had appeared on vases to fight Herakles and was shown with a fishy body until, for one reason or another,²⁸ Triton took over the role and physical appearance and Nereus became wholly human for most scenes.²⁹ The Triton who wrestled Herakles had been forgotten by the time of our cup,³⁰ where he appears simply as the child of Poseidon and Amphitrite (Hesiod, *Theogony* 930-3) and is otherwise occupied only in support of his half-brother Theseus on his underwater mission to Amphitrite.³¹ He does not normally attend this episode.³² The startled Nereids, however, do appear, but never before so explicitly identified. Hesiod lists all fifty Nereids (*Theogony* 240-64) including these. This need not have been the only possible source for the artist but it is the likely one and the 'short list' of thirty-three in *Iliad* xviii, 39-49, has only Glauke and Kymothoe of our five names.³³ He has been careful to find names and to find the right ones. Again he refreshes the stock theme by literary allusion.

Beazley classes the cup with the Kleophrades Painter's 'later' works and it dates probably little after 480. It is past the period in which the artist usually makes much use of thinned paint lines or areas on dress but there is still considerable use of colour for hair and accessories, and we have the unusual degree of patterning on the chitons of two Nereids.³⁴ He is free with white on hair, as he is on the Würzburg amphora with Ajax and Hector, which Beazley singled out for comparison.³⁵

It will be observed that the general schemes of the

28) See Boardman, *RA* 1972, 59f.

29) Exception: see next note.

30) Beazley has two fishy Tritons fighting Herakles in Archaic red figure: they are Acr. 147, pl. 6; *ARV* 89, no. 19 (Euergides Painter) and a mild-Brygan cup, *Ann.d'I.* 1882, pl. K; *ARV* 1652. A fishy Nereus attends the struggle with Thetis on the Berlin Painter stamnos (see note 24).

31) Paris G 104; *ARV* 318, no. 1 (Onesimos); Arias-Hirmer, op. cit., pl. 134. And New York 53.11.4; *ARV* 406, no. 7 (Briseis Painter); *Bull. Met. Mus.* 1954, 62f.

32) The Niobid Painter includes him on the lekanis lid, Naples 2638; *ARV* 607, no. 89; *Mon. Ined.* i, pl. 37.

33) See M. L. West, *Hesiod, Theogony* 235ff. for a discussion of some of the names. Our Kymathea is Kymothoe in Hesiod and Homer. For other Nereid names on vases see P. Kretschmer, *Die griechischen Vasenschriften* (1894) 200-2, 238. The Achilles Painter is comparably explicit on the Würzburg dinos (540; Langlotz, pls. 198-9; *ARV* 992, no. 69) naming Kymathoe, Nao, Melite, Speo, Glauke, Psamathe, Kymatolege—all in Hesiod but (if Nao = Sao) only four in the *Iliad*.


34) Compare the net pattern on the dress of a woman in the fragmentary Mission (?) to Achilles scene on a calyx crater from the Agora, *Hesperia* xxxv (1966) pl. 10g (*ARV* 186, nos. 39 & 46). One explanation for the figure is that it is a Nereid bringing armour for Achilles.

35) See note 13. Compare too the treatment of shield interior, snake on scabbard, details of the back views of the greaved legs (Hector and Ares).

compositions on sides A and B of the cup are very similar—the same Athena; the attackers differing only in their over-arm or under-arm attack; the victims in the same posture; the broken spear motif; only the fourth figure differs because the story demands it. Correspondence of theme between one side of a vase and the other, or even continuation of the theme, is a common enough phenomenon. At first sight the connection here may seem compositional only and not thematic, but the Kleophrades Painter surely invites us by the similarity in composition to compare the subjects also. On both Athena is the patron of a successful hero who is daring to face an Olympian in battle over the stricken body of that Olympian's son. We know that Herakles will go on to wound Ares (*Shield* 458-62), just as we now that Diomedes will go on to wound Aphrodite (*Iliad* v, 334-40), and indeed, soon afterwards, wound the hapless Ares (855-61). It might well be too that the interior scene, where a hero is actually wrestling with an immortal, expecting to win as his bride a goddess once sought by Zeus, was chosen in the same spirit. The Kleophrades Painter was always a 'deep one'. It would be good to know, but may seem idle to speculate on, what occasion or patron led him to compose this essay on the discomfiture of Olympians at the hands of 'mortal' heroes, but the approach is compatible with that he displays on the contemporary Vivenzio hydria, with its commentary on the sacking of a great city, the horrors of war and the courage and hope such events can summon forth. Athens' recent sack, yet ultimate victory over the invincible, could well have been somewhere in his mind.³⁶

John Boardman
Merton College, Oxford

36) I revert to the theme of the Kleophrades Painter at Troy elsewhere.



A



B

Two Bronze Hydriai in Malibu

Bronze hydriai¹ constitute the most impressive class of ancient Greek bronze vessels that have been preserved. They exist in numbers large enough to reward a close study of the development of the shape through three centuries and to permit a classification of types by shape. Their survival is in part based on the secondary uses of the vessels. The primary function was that of a water jar. Two horizontal handles at or near the level of the biggest diameter made for ease in lifting the vessel which, when filled with water, must have been quite heavy. The vertical handle facilitated pouring by tipping the vase.

In most ordinary households such a water jar was made of fired clay, and terracotta hydriai were made in all parts of the Greek world where pottery was practised. In bronze the graceful shape was selected as a prize in many competitions held at different festivals. This we learn not only from identifying inscriptions sometimes placed on the rim of the hydria but also from representations on painted vases that portray Victories carrying hydriai as a reward. The shape also made hydriai excellent receptacles for ballots cast in voting: their bodies were capacious, and their narrow necks obscured the contents, rendering the ballots already cast invisible to the voter who was dropping his pebble into the vessel—a necessary step in any endeavor to make balloting secret. This is best illustrated on an Attic red-figured cup in Dijon attributed by Beazley to the Stieglitz Painter² (fig. 1).

As prized possessions bronze hydriai were also offered at sanctuaries as dedications, and, finally, many of them served as cinerary urns for the ashes of the owner or members of his family. Since hydriai normally have no cover, in this case, a lid was often improvised and attached to the mouth of the vase. Most of these lids have now disappeared or become separated from the hydriai to which they had once been attached, but from the traces of solder on the mouth or from the presence of rivet holes the funerary use of a bronze hydria can often be deduced.

In the construction of a bronze hydria two techniques used together can be observed. The thin-walled body of the vase is raised from one or two disks of sheet-metal. Those that have a very pronounced shoulder usually are hammered in two parts. First a single big disk is raised to take the shape up to the level half-way between neck and shoulder; then a tube flaring at both ends is welded to

the shoulder. The foot, the three handles, and sometimes even the mouth are not hammered, but cast, and attached with solder or rivets.

Since bronzes in antiquity were kept clean and polished, patina being not an artistic embellishment, but, like incrustation, something to be avoided, there was no need to gild small bronzes and bronze vessels as has sometimes been mistakenly asserted.³ Clean bronze, especially when hammered, has a sheen and lustre rivaling those of gold. On the other hand, silver inlays were at times employed which would be in perfect contrast to the golden color of bronze.

There are over three hundred and thirty Greek bronze hydriai known, both complete vases and such parts as reliefs, handles, or feet of a vase. Of this impressive number more than forty are in the United States, almost all of them on the East Coast. The two bronze hydriai here published, now in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, are the first to have been acquired by a museum on the West Coast.

The earlier of the two (figs. 2, 5, 6, 8; Acc. no. 73.AC.-12) belongs to a small class that has been assembled around a prize hydria in New York which bears an inscription identifying it as a prize at the games of the Argive sanctuary of Hera.⁴ In this class the back handle rises high above the rim and terminates above in a sculptural adjunct, the upper part of a woman. Her garment, basically a peplos, is modified to cover her arms that are bent at the elbows and hug the rim of the vase. From this shawl-like wrap, however, no hands emerge: in their place we find two rotellae standing on edge. Their slightly concave fronts are either plain or are treated as flowers with petals in one or two layers modelled in relief. Halfway between the elbows and the rotellae two hoops cover the forearms, clamping them, as it were, to the rim of the vessel. The lower part of the back handle terminates in an escutcheon-like plaque decorated in relief with a palmette, and the same convention is followed for the attachment of the side handles. A simple ring-base serves as the foot.

Of the ten back handles in this class, no two are identical. In the most sumptuous of them, New York 26.50 (figs. 3, 4, 7), the head is higher than the upper curve of the handle behind it, and in this respect, as well as in the coiffure, the Malibu hydria resembles it closely, whereas on the hydria from Sinope, a handle in New York, and a

1) The most recent comprehensive treatment of bronze hydriai is given by Erika Diehl in *Die Hydria, Formgeschichte und Verwendung im Kult des Altertums* (Mayence, 1964); additions to her catalogue of bronze hydriai are to be found in *Gnomon* 37 (1965) pp. 599-608, where, in fact, the second of the Malibu hydriai is mentioned (*l.c.* p. 604).

2) The red-figured cup by the Stieglitz Painter in Dijon (Beazley *Attic Red-figure Vase-painters* (Oxford, 1963) p. 829, no. 37) has recently

been augmented and is here published with kind permission given by P. Quarrè.

3) Diehl *op. cit.* passim (cf. *Gnomon l.c.* p. 599).

4) Diehl *op. cit.* p. 216, nos. B 75-82. Her group should be split up, as the earliest members, B 75 and B 76 (to which additions were made in *Gnomon*) are separated from the group proper by more than a generation.

handle in Paris (Musée des Arts Decoratifs), the handle proper curves higher than the crown of the head. The bronze hydria in Oxford (Miss.) shares the coiffure with the Malibu and the New York hydriai, but the head is now completely detached from the curve of the handle and rises higher. The four remaining members of the class are Lyon and Berlin 8064, both very close to one another, and Boston 99.469, which takes with it Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg I.N. 3293. On these four the hair terminates in a ponytail that rests on the curve of the handle proper. Taking the head of the woman as a chronological criterion the class can perhaps be arranged in the following sequence:

1. New York 56.11.2 (fig. 9)
2. Ankara, from Sinope
3. Paris, Musée des Arts Decoratifs 27178
4. New York 26.50 (figs. 3, 4, 7)
5. Malibu 73.AC.12.1 (figs. 2, 5, 6, 8)
6. Oxford, Miss.
7. Berlin 8064
8. Lyon
9. Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg I.N. 3293
10. Boston 99.469

The date of the Malibu hydria should be ca. 460 B.C.

The other hydria in Malibu, 73.AC.15 (figs. 10-13), is at least a hundred years later. In shape and decoration it belongs to the class of hydriai with narrative reliefs below the back handle,⁵ a class that developed from the fifth century type of bronze hydria in which the back handle had a siren finial.⁶ In the siren-hydriai the monster is shown frontally with the wings spread to either side. The wings thus hide the awkward junction of the handle and the sculptural finial. When the standard siren gives way to other subjects, the choice at first is limited to those figures that like the siren have wings. Hence we encounter Eros, either alone or with another figure, Iris and Zephyros, and Boreas abducting Oreithya. Later the scope of subjects widens and non-winged figures like Dionysos and his entourage appear.

Some of the earliest reliefs that decorate these hydriai are cast and soldered on; later the standard technique is that of repoussé. This technique was also successfully employed for the decoration of bronze mirror covers⁷ and we have instances where the same compositions appear both on mirrors and on hydriai.⁸ The subject of the Malibu handle relief is a gigantomachy: Athena—identified by her aegis—wears a long dress, a helmet

with upturned cheek-pieces, and carries a heavy round shield; she defeats a naked giant who has fallen on his right knee and is attacked by a snake that encircles his body and bites him in the left side. Athena braces her right knee against his left thigh and appears to stab him in the back, though the precise action of her right hand cannot be made out. The giant tries in vain to ward off Athena. The terrain on which the combat takes place is stippled and has several flowers seen in top view.

While there are no close parallels for the composition among the many bronze mirrors, the combat scenes on them are often reduced to a duel, with victor and vanquished clearly distinguished. The gigantomachies on the mirror-covers normally feature Dionysos or Artemis, and the snake on the relief in Malibu is more at home in a scene that has Dionysos as the protagonist (occurring in this context already on black-figured vases) but it is no stranger to the duel of Athena since at least the middle of the fifth century B.C.⁹ The name of Athena's principal opponent is often given as Enkelados, but Berektas or Laertas are inscribed on the frieze of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi, and Aristotle mentions a certain Asterios (fr. 637 Rose).¹⁰

There is little ornamentation on the vase. The mouth is decorated with a carefully chased kymation, but the side handles are plain and lack pattern-work on the attachments. The back handle is carinated. Its upper attachment is plain and the lower finial is curiously obscured by an amorphous attachment that resembles a cloth hung over the handle rather than the exuberant acanthus or the like that normally grows in that area.

The shape of the vase, the choice of the subject and the compositional style suggest a date in the third quarter of the fourth century B.C.

Dietrich von Bothmer
The Metropolitan Museum of Art

5) Diehl *op. cit.* pp. 221-222, nos. B 178-204 (with addenda in *Gnomon* pp. 604-605).

6) Diehl *op. cit.* pp. 219-220, nos. B 137-169 (*Gnomon* pp. 603-604).

7) Cf. Züchner *Griechische Klappspiegel* (Berlin 1942).

8) Notably Boreas and Oreithya (cf. Züchner *op. cit.* p. 62, KS 87) and

Dionysos and Ariadne (cf. *BMMA* n.s. 13 [1954-1955] pp. 199 ff).

9) Cf. calyx-krater Ferrara T 313 (Beazley *op. cit.* p. 602, no. 24).

10) On gigantomachies see F. Vian *La guerre des géants* (Paris 1952), passim; which must be used in conjunction with his earlier work *Répertoire des Gigantomachies figurées dans l'art grec et romain* (Paris 1951).



1 Red-figure cup in Dijon (1301) by the Stieglitz Painter

2



3



2,5,6 Bronze hydria. J. Paul Getty Museum 73.AC.12

3,4,7 Bronze hydria. Metropolitan Museum of Art 26.50

6



4



5



7







8 Detail from 2

9 Metropolitan Museum
of Art 56.11.2





10-13 Bronze hydria. J. Paul Getty Museum 73.AC.15





Identification, Age and Date of Skeletal Material Found in a Greek Hydria

The preceding paper, by Dietrich von Bothmer, has analyzed from the art history point of view a Greek bronze hydria in the J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu (73.AC.12). This particular hydria has also a certain anthropological value in that it was found to contain small broken human bones, ashes, fiber, a few glass beads and small snail shells. In this companion paper the nature of the contents of the hydria are examined to shed some light on its last actual use and age.

Most of the bone material is composed of fragments from human long bones with an average size of 1 by 2 cm. About 98 percent of these fragments are from diaphysical portions of long bones such as femur, humerus, tibia and ulna. Unfortunately, none can be identified as to sex or age of the individual. However, the general thickness of the primary bone suggests a fairly young individual under 10 years in age.

However, several fragments of cranial material have been preserved, such as small pieces of periost from the cranial vault, probably frontal, and very thin. One such piece from the *Os frontale* shows well preserved *Lamina interna*, some adhering spongiosa of the Diploe with several identifiable *Canales diploici*. This piece which is about 1.5 by 2 cm in size is transversed by a suture of uncertain identity. The thickness of the periost and openness of the suture as well as its non-obliterated meandering suggests in fact an individual of very young age, less than 5 years old.

Two other bone fragments allowing a fairly good estimate of the age of the individual can be fitted together as part of the left *Os zygomaticum*. The fracture occurred 0.5 cm lateral from the *Foramen zygomaticofaciale* and 0.5 cm lateral from the *Foramen zygomaticorbitale*. The piece of bone shows both sutures to the *Processi zygomatici* of the *Corpus maxillae* as well as the frontal. The *Processus frontalis* with the *Tuberculum marginale* is well preserved just as the *Facies lateralis*. The *Processus temporalis* is, however, only present in its superior portion.

The *Foramen zygomaticofaciale* is elongated in shape and quite large, as one would expect in a very young individual. The *Facies temporalis* shows a large *Foramen zygomaticotemporale* and is broken in its inferior portion. Overall, when compared to the *Os zygomaticum* of an adolescent or an adult, the size and the thickness suggest the individual's age to be less than 5 years.

Present among the other skeletal material are numer-

ous fragments of all the teeth, deciduous. There are no second molars or crown pieces of first molars, but pieces of medial and lateral incisors (I_1 , I_2 , I^1 , I^2) and one mandibular canine (C_1). Taking into consideration the full development of mandibular and maxillary canines between ca. 19 and 20 months in deciduous teeth, and the absence of second molars, usually present between 25 and 28 months, the best estimate for the age of the individual is close to two years.

The bone fragments offered the possibility of dating the skeletal remains in time using collagen radiocarbon dating. For this purpose the bones were treated in cold diluted acid to dissolve the mineral matter short of collagen hydrolysis¹. Then the collagen isolated was purified in the manner described by Protsch² in order to remove any traces of other organic contamination. Finally, the purified and dried collagen sample was burnt in a stream of oxygen and completely converted to carbon dioxide. This gas was extensively purified to remove all electronegative impurities to a grade of less than a few ppm. Subsequently the isotopic ratio of C^{14}/C^{12} was determined over a time span of 7000 minutes in the proportional counter at UCLA. The relatively small sample of bone available resulted in a larger than normal statistical error for the radiocarbon date which was calculated to be 2450 ± 100 years.

This radiocarbon date was then calibrated against the bristlecone pine tree-ring chronology of H. E. Suess³. In this manner fluctuations of the production rate of radiocarbon in time are accounted for, since the bristlecone pine correlation itself is rooted in an oak dendrochronology as well as historical chronologies. Consequently, the longest tree-ring series, determined by dendrochronology, of the California bristlecone pine (*Pinus aristata*) provides a series of time increments synonymous with calendric years. As a result of this calibration, the bones can be dated around 500 B.C. with the error reduced by the calibration to plus or minus half a century.

An additional isotopic analysis of radiocarbon was carried out to see if the hydria had been hermetically sealed after the individual had been placed into it. To this purpose some of the bones were burnt directly in a stream of oxygen, so that any carbonate contained in ground water of more recent age would be admixed with the carbonate and collagen native to bone. After the usual purification of the gas sample the isotopic ratio of C^{14}/C^{12} was determined showing significant

1) R. Berger, A. G. Horney and W. F. Libby, Science 144, 999 (1964).

2) R. Protsch, Dissertation, UCLA: *The Dating of Upper Pleistocene Subsaharan Fossil Hominids*, 1973.

3) H. E. Suess, *Bristlecone Pine Calibration of the Radiocarbon Time-*

Scale 5200 B.C. to the Present, in Nobel Symposium 12, Radiocarbon Variations and Absolute Chronology, I. U. Olsson, Ed. Almqvist and Wiksell, Stockholm, 1970.

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation.

contamination equivalent in age to approximately 1000 years. Consequently, the hydria was not hermetically sealed but rather only covered in such a way that moisture containing other carbonates was allowed to enter.

In summary, the osteological and radioisotopic analyses show that this particular Greek hydria was used around 500 B.C. as a burial vessel for a child approximately 2 years in age.

Rainer Berger

Departments of Anthropology and Geography
Institute of Geophysics and Planetary Physics
University of California, Los Angeles

Reiner Protsch

Anthropologisches Institut
J. W. Goethe-Universität
Frankfurt/Main

A Fourth-Century Funerary Stele in the J. Paul Getty Museum

In the Spring of 1974 the J. Paul Getty Museum acquired an inscribed grave stele (73.AA.133), which preserves two figures: a man, bearded, in profile, and a girl on his right in flatter relief. The man is obviously gazing downward at a third figure, now missing, who was seated and may have been a woman.¹ The top of the stele was decorated with five antefixes, three of which survive. The monument is made of fine crystallized white marble, which may be Pentelic.² The inscription, a two-line epigram in dactylic hexameter, runs as follows:³

Fourth century B.C. non-stoichedon ca.40

[...ca. 13-16...] αἰε Ἀγακλείδας μνήματι σὸς παῖ[ς]
[...ca. 13-16...] -ον καὶ ἀφελφῶν <δ>|αινετὰν αὐτ[οῦ]

The dimensions of the stele are: height 0.200 m.; width 0.390 m. (total), 0.320 m. (inscribed surface); thickness 0.110 m.; height of letters 0.010 m.

Epigraphical Commentary

Line 1: In the last letter-space preserved on the stone a vertical stroke (ca. 0.004 m.) is evident in the center of the letter-space. Iota or kappa is possible.

Line 2: Of the first extant letter-space all that survives is ca. 0.002 m. of the tip of a horizontal stroke in the upper right corner of the letter-space. This could belong to an epsilon, zeta, tau, gamma, or xi. In the seventh extant letter-space ca. 0.003 m. of two diagonal strokes that intersect in the center of the letter-space has survived. Delta, lambda or alpha is possible here. Along the right edge of the eighth extant letter-space a trace of a diagonal stroke for ca. 0.002 m. is visible. Alpha, lambda, or delta is again possible. In the fourteenth extant letter-space the mason inscribed an alpha, a mistake for a delta.⁴ The fifteenth extant letter-space has a faint trace of a vertical stroke, possibly an iota, for ca. 0.005 m., which cannot easily be detected from the photograph. The mason probably covered up his mistake in the fourteenth letter-space by painting in the horizontal stroke of the delta. The faint vertical stroke of the fifteenth would have been painted, as were all the other letters.

Commentary

Both the style of the relief and the letter forms point

to a date some time in the fourth century B.C. The figures on the relief can be compared with those on Attic grave stelai from the mid-fourth century B.C., which contain multiple figures.⁵ K. Friis Johansen in his monograph on Attic grave reliefs notes that Attic sculptors added more figures to what were often "simple compositions", i.e., representations of only the dead person, after 400 B.C.:⁶ "The tendency to add more figures to the originally simple compositions and to make them more complex has already been mentioned several times as characteristic of a large part of fourth-century Attic grave reliefs, a tendency which stands in a very close relation to the development of the relief from a linear design in one plane towards a tridimensional treatment with different planes and the figures of the foreground cut in high relief, some times also in the round. This development reaches its culmination in what is known as the family 'group', which in its typical form first occurs on sepulchral monuments from the latter half of the century".

The alphabet in which the inscription is written is Ionic and the letter-forms may be compared with those of official Athenian documents from the first half of the fourth century B.C.⁷ The dialect of the inscription is not Attic-Ionic, but one of the Doric group of the West Greek dialects, with one exception: in line 1, *μνήματι* instead of *μνάματι*.⁸ To which dialect exactly among these this inscription belongs cannot be determined from the inscription alone.⁹ Nevertheless, it must come from a state that had close ties to Athens in the fourth century B.C. or a state which bordered Attica and received strong Attic influence by the middle of the century. Of the Doric group in the West Greek dialects, Megara and the states in the Argolic group, particularly Epidaurus, stand out as the most likely. The proximity of Megara to Attica and the strong Attic influences both in the style of the relief and in the letter-forms mark it as one logical candidate for the provenance of the piece. Athenian influences on Epidaurian inscriptions, however, are well-known and this part of the Argolid cannot be ruled out.¹⁰ For the extent of Athenian influence on the official orthography of Boiotian states as early as 394 B.C., see P. Roesch and J. Taillardat, *Rev. Phil.* (1966) 70-87:¹¹ "L'inventaire sacré de Thespies, l'alphabet attique en Béotie".

1) I wish to thank Dr. Jiří Frel for permission to publish this inscription and relief.

2) Cf. W. K. Pritchett and N. G. Herz, "Marble in Attic Epigraphy", *A.J.A.* 57 (1953), 71-83.

3) For the sigla used here see S. Dow, *Conventions in Editing*, Duke University, 1969, pp. 6-12.

4) An example of an alpha inscribed for a delta is cited by Dow, *op. cit.* no. 3, p. 11.

5) Cf. Christoph W. Clairmont, *Gravestone and Epigram*, Mainz on Rhine, 1970, p. 134, no. 56, and Hans Diepolder, *Die attischen Grabreliefs*, Berlin, 1931, plates 42.2 and 44.

6) K. Friis Johansen, *The Attic Grave-Reliefs*, Copenhagen, 1951, pp. 42-46.

7) Cf. J. Kirchner, *Imagines Inscriptionum Atticarum*², Berlin, 1948, no. 43 = I.G. II² 1, 403/2 B.C.; no. 53 = I.G. II² 105, 368/7 B.C.

8) See C. D. Buck, *The Greek Dialects*, Chicago, 1928, pp. 11-12, pp. 154-155.

9) The use of original $\bar{\alpha}$ for η is common to most dialects except Attic-Ionic. See Buck, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

10) See Buck, *op. cit.*, p. 164: "Definite Attic forms are frequent in Epidaurian inscriptions of the early fourth century B.C. (see no. 90 note)".

11) Cf. J. and L. Robert, *REG* 80 (1967), 495-496.



1 Inscribed grave stele, 4th c. B.C.; J. Paul Getty Museum 73.AA.133.

The width of the piece and the number of missing letters can be determined by measuring the distance from the next to last antefix on top of the stele to the edge (0.125 m.) and multiplying this by four (0.490 m.). Subtracting 0.320 m. (the width of the inscribed surface) from 0.490 m. (the estimated total width) gives 0.170 m., enough space for 13 to 16 letters.¹² Since the inscription is in dactylic hexameter, this provides some control over the width of the missing section:

[ca. 13-16] αἰε Ἀγακλείδας μνήματι σὸς παῖ[ς]
[ca. 13-16] ον καὶ ἀδελφάν <δ>αἰνετὰν αὐτ[οῦ]

In the first line only parts of the first foot and the first syllable of the second foot are missing; in line two the first two feet of the hexameter are missing. Therefore, four or five syllables in the first line and six in the second line are lacking.

The name, Ἀγακλείδας, is not found in Pape-Benseler or Bechtel¹³, but other names that terminate in -κλείδας are attested, e.g., Δορυκλείδας Λακεδαιμόνιος.¹⁴ In the *index nominum* to I.G. VII, names ending in -κλείδας are attested in Megara.¹⁵ Another possible occurrence of the name appears at line 33 of I.G. I² 87, the treaty of Athens and Halieis, dated to 424/3, where [ca. 32] ος Ἀγακ- [λ....] is listed as one of the ambassadors from Halieis who swore the oath.¹⁶ In line two the word <δ>αἰνετὰν is not attested as far as I know. It must, however, be the verbal adjective of διαίνω—to moisten, wet, which takes on the meaning, to weep, in the middle voice.¹⁷

Restored text and interpretation of the monument:

[ca. 14] κλ] αἰε Ἀγακλείδας μνήματι σὸς παῖ[ς]
[ματέρα ca. 10] τον καὶ ἀδελφάν <δ>αἰνετὰν αὐτ[οῦ]

I have restored as the main verb [ca. 14] κλ] αἰε which is common in grave inscriptions.¹⁸ What preceded the main verb cannot be restored, since no parallels for this inscription exist, as far as I know.¹⁹ The fourteen spaces may have contained a name of one of the deceased. The subject of the main verb is Ἀγακλείδας with σος παῖ[ς] in apposition. He is the bearded male figure on the relief who is gazing down at a seated figure, surely one of his parents. At the beginning of line two I have restored [ματέρα ca. 10] simply because it fits the meter: ματέρα. It is by no means the sole solution.²⁰ The female figure to the right of Agakleidas is the ἀδελφάν <δ>αἰνετὰν αὐτ[οῦ], his lamented sister, whom the καὶ connects to the missing seated figure.²¹ The inscription may be translated as follows: "Agakleidas, your son, at the moment (?) weeps for his mother (?)... and his lamented sister".²²

Joseph Breslin
Los Angeles

12) The space occupied by 13 letters varies. In line one the distance between the delta of Ἀγακλείδας and the final sigma of σὸς is 0.160 m.; the distance between the gamma of Ἀγακλείδας and the second mu of μνήματι is 0.155 m. In line two, the distance between the preserved omicron and the nu of ἀδελφάν is 0.145 m. Each letter takes up about 0.0115 m. This allows for 16 missing letters or possibly 17 if the mason wished to squeeze an additional one in, as he did to the iota of <δ>αἰνετὰν. All measurements of the distances between letters were from edge to edge.

13) W. Pape, Gustav Benseler, *Wörterbücher der griechischen Eigennamen*³, Braunschweig, 1911; F. Bechtel, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle, 1917.

14) See Bechtel, *op. cit.*, pp. 242f.

15) Cf. I.G. VII, 29, 32.

16) See B. D. Meritt, *Hesperia* 14 (1945), 99-105.

17) L.S.J., s.v. διαίνω.

18) See Werner Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte*, Berlin, 1960, Register, κλαίω, p. 376; cf. Peek, *Verzeichnis der Gedicht-Anfänge und vergleichende Übersicht zu den griechischen Vers-Inschriften I*, Berlin, 1957, p. 18. For examples of the inconsistent use of E = εἰ and O = οὐ in Attic inscriptions of the first part of the fourth century see M. N.

Tod, *Greek Historical Inscriptions*. II, Oxford, 1948, nos. 101, 103, 126.

19) I have searched both works by Peek and could find no parallels.

20) See Dow, *op. cit.*, no. 3, pp. 28-9, on the hazards of restoring verse. Cf. also W. K. Pritchett, *Ancient Athenian Calendars on Stone*, University of California Publications in Classical Archaeology, Vol. 4, No. 4, Berkeley, 1963, pp. 373-384. Here as in line one the vacant spaces could preserve the name of the deceased, either the mother or the father. The letters τον may belong to an adjective that would modify either the name, ματέρα, or πατέρα. I can find no suitable parallels to cite in support of further restoration.

21) The αὐτ[οῦ] is reflexive. See F. Bechtel, *Die griechischen Dialekte*, II, Berlin, 1923, p. 201, for an example of αὐτὸς as reflexive in the Megarian dialect.

22) Μνήματι is translated as a *dativus loci*. The use of the dative as locative, however, is common only with place names in Attic inscriptions. Cf. K. Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³, Berlin, 1900, p. 208. This epigram, however, is not an exact parallel for the restoration suggested here. For an earlier example of a son burying two people, his parents, cf. P. Friedländer, *Epigrammata*, Berkeley, 1948, p. 84.

A Set of Archaic Greek Jewelry

In 1972 the J. Paul Getty Museum purchased a group of thirteen silver finger rings, one silver hair ring, and a silver bracelet, all said to have been found at Gela in Sicily. The thirteen silver finger rings are especially interesting since they constitute one of the largest single holdings with a known provenience of this particular style of archaic Greek ring, type F in the shape categories established by J. Boardman.¹ Boardman dates group F from the mid-sixth to the early fifth century.² Among the Getty rings there is considerable variation in quality, ranging from the extremely fine workmanship of no. 1 to the rather cursory work of no. 12. Some of the rings are also so worn that it is difficult to assess their original quality.

With only two exceptions the rings bear animal devices. These devices can often be closely paralleled in the imagery of contemporary S. Italian coins. Certainly both coins and rings were produced in much the same manner and very probably by the same craftsmen. Besides this similarity of manufacture, rings and coins may also be related with respect to their function. Engraved silver rings were undoubtedly a less expensive substitute for the engraved gem stones of the wealthy. Thus, both rings and gems could be emblazoned with personal emblems or insignia. As Richter has pointed out, "the coins, which bear, so to speak, the seal of the state were the public counterparts of the gems with the seal of the individual."³ It is impossible, in any case, to know what significance these devices may have had for the owners of the rings. Most probably the designs meant a great many different things, while sometimes they were purely decorative.

All of the rings are silver which, according to Boardman, is the most common material for rings of this type. Their curious form, with a diamond-shaped bezel and one open or soldered joint in the middle of the back (fig. 3b),⁴ demonstrates that they were made from a single piece of metal. A bar of silver, circular in section,

was cut, the center of the bar stretched and flattened to create the bezel, then the whole piece bent and usually soldered shut.⁵ On most of the Getty rings the incised decoration is confined to the bezel face, though several have a hatched band running along the upper and lower surfaces of the bezel (nos. 1, 3, and 4). On no. 2 an even stippling occurs all around the back band of the ring on its less worn side.

One of the rings (no. 4) was originally embellished with a metallic stud. The stud is missing, but its neat, round hole is clearly visible.⁶ The practice of inserting such studs into silver rings, especially of this type, was extremely common.⁷ These studs could be inserted anywhere in the face of the bezel. Apparently they had some apotropaic function, possibly as protection against the evil eye.⁸

The importance of the rings lies neither in their iconographic significance nor in their artistic quality, however. Rather, it is the presence of thirteen rings in a single hoard which provides strong confirmation for the argument that most examples of this type of ring were manufactured in Magna Grecia.⁹ Until now only a few isolated rings of this type have been found in S. Italy.¹⁰ With the appearance of this group, all found at Gela, the origin in Magna Grecia of the type seems assured.

1. 72.AI.36.1 Silver. Diameter: 2.67 cm.¹¹ Weight: 16 g. Crouching lioness facing left. Small ovals in each corner of the bezel. Hatched border on face of bezel supplemented by border extending around top and bottom edges. Both this ring and the following one have an extremely thick hoop. Figure 1.¹²

The combination of a crouching animal and palmette is comparable to a more finely executed ring in the British Museum with a female boar flanked by palmettes.¹³ The artist of our ring seems to have miscalculated the size of his field. He puts a palmette and an oval in front of the lion, but only has room for an en-

1) John Boardman, *Antike Kunst* X (1967) 3-28; Boardman, *Greek Gems and Finger Rings* (London, 1970) 154 ff.

2) Boardman, *Gems and Rings*, 155.

3) G.M.A. Richter, *Catalogue of Engraved Gems, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman* [Metropolitan Museum of Art] (New York, 1956 ed.) 24.

4) This joint is clearly visible on all the rings. On several of them it has broken open.

5) Boardman, *Antike Kunst*, 18.

6) There is a squarish hole in 72.AI.36.10 (no. 6 in my list). It seems, however, to be the result either of wear or an ancient patch. This bezel is extremely thin and probably wore through in antiquity.

7) Boardman, *Antike Kunst*, nos. F2, F3, F4, F16, F24, F30 with stud still in place and F10 with stud missing.

8) F.H. Marshall, *Catalogue of the Finger Rings, Greek, Etruscan, and Roman, in the British Museum* (London, 1907) xxiii. See also A. Furtwängler, *Die antiken Gemmen* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1900) III, 90;

H. B. Walters, *JHS* XXIV (1924) 332f; J. Boardman, *Papers of the British School at Rome* XXXIV (1966) 6.

9) Boardman remarks upon the "singular dearth of reliable proveniences in this large group [Group F]." Then he suggests that some of the finer examples may have come from Greece itself, though he assigns a fairly large group to Etruria, S. Italy, and Sicily. *Antike Kunst*, 18; *Gems and Finger Rings*, 155.

10) Boardman list, *Antike Kunst*, 19f: F17, Naples; F19, Dodona; F20 and F21, Selinus; F22 and 23, Oliveto Citra; F24, probably Armienta-in-Basilicata.

11) Widest external diameter.

12) Figure numbers correspond to numbers of descriptive entries.

13) Marshall, *Catalogue*, no. 1016, pl. XXVI. Boardman corrects Marshall's identification, pointing out that the animal is female in *Antike Kunst*, F36, 20.

larged oval behind it. A lion at bay appears on the coinage of Hyele in the fifth century, as does the boar on the somewhat earlier coinage of the neighboring cities of Palinurus and Molpa.¹⁴ In each instance when the animals are fitted into the diamond-shaped field of the bezel, their pose becomes somewhat different than on the circular field of the coins. The treatment of their anatomy is not, in any case, strictly comparable to that on the coins. However, given the similarity to coins from adjacent towns, perhaps we have two rings from a single workshop, which, if not located near Hyele-Palinurus-Molpa, was at least familiar with their coinage.

2. 72.AI.36.5 Silver. Diameter: 2.61 cm. Weight: 12.3 g. Flying bird, probably an eagle, on left facing dolphin on right. Surrounded by hatched border. Surface quite worn.

Boardman notes four rings of type F with dolphins, either singly or paired with other animals.¹⁵ Dolphins appear on the coins of Zancle from c.510. Here the dolphin's movement is juxtaposed to that of the eagle so as to suggest their separate realms of sea and land.

3. 72.AI.36.7 Silver. Diameter: 2.31 cm. Weight: 6.1 g. Ketos facing right. Herringbone design border on upper edge of bezel, but no border around its face.

A sea monster, or ketos, appears in the exergue of Syracusan coins beginning c. 474. Its inclusion is often considered a reference to the Sicilian naval victory over the Etruscans at Cumae in that year.¹⁶ The ketos on Syracusan coins is quite similar to ours.¹⁷ Both have a horse-like head, long snaky body with spines and a fin or wing. Our ketos, however, has its fin and spines on the lower side of its body, reversing the anatomy of the coin ketos.

4. 72.AI.36.11 Silver. Diameter: 2.44 cm. Weight: 6.2 g. Crouching lion facing left. On the extreme left side of bezel a smoothly bored round hole originally filled by a now lost stud. There is no hatched border on the face of the bezel, but there is one on its upper and lower edges.

The body of this lion is extremely stylized. It is composed of simple, curvilinear shapes describing considerable volume. What anatomical details there are do not express the structure of the animal's body; their function is purely decorative.

5. 72.AI.36.3 Silver. Diameter: 2.22 cm. Weight: 2.8 g.

Lobster seen from above. Bezel face surrounded by hatched border. Original surface mostly lost around the antennae of the lobster.

Though the crustacean has been extremely stylized, its anatomy reduced to a symmetrical pattern composed of straight and angular lines, the identification seems certain. A more naturalistic lobster appears on a bronze ring in the British Museum.¹⁸ The late Archaic ring in the British Museum was found at Sidon, but according to Boardman is of Sicilian origin.¹⁹ (The presence of two rings with lobsters in our group, this one and the following, lend weight to Boardman's provenience for the British Museum ring.) The stylized lobster on the Getty ring fits very conveniently into the field of the bezel, filling nearly all the available surface.

6. 72.AI.36.10 Silver. Diameter: 2.18 cm. Weight: 4.6 g. Lobster seen from above. Hatched border around face of bezel. Roughly rectangular portion of ring lost in the middle of lobster's body.

See entry no. 5.

7. 72.AI.36.4 Silver. Diameter: 2.245 cm. Weight: 2.9 g. Rooster facing left. Bezel surface badly abraded on right side. Hatched border around face of bezel.

Our rooster has been fitted into the bezel field with some difficulty; both his feet and head overlap the border. Roosters appear on the earliest coins of Himera, beginning c. 520. Himeran roosters, standing with both feet on the ground as the ring rooster does, appear on coins of c.500.²⁰ This bird can also be compared to the roosters which appear on Panathenaic amphorae. Among fragments of these amphorae found on the Athenian Acropolis our bird can be compared to a rooster by the Berlin Painter, especially in its full modelling, though its double tail is closest to the tails of roosters by the Eucharides Painter.²¹

8. 72.AI.36.8 Silver. Diameter: 2.123 cm. Weight: 2.7 g. Crocodile seen from above. Hatched border around face of bezel. Tip of bezel lost on one side.

The animal depicted can be identified either as a lizard or a larger reptile, an alligator or crocodile. The latter possibility is more likely for the very reason that the animal is not correctly depicted, a Greek or S. Italian artist being most likely ill acquainted with such tropical animals. A type of simplified palmette serves very nicely

14) Kraay, Colin M. and Max Hirmer, *Greek Coins* (New York, 1966): stater, c.530-510, no. 223, pl. 79; diadrachm, c.480, no. 225, pl. 80.
15) Boardman, *Antike Kunst*, F10, F11, F27, F35.

16) Colin Kraay takes exception to this interpretation in *Greek Coins and History* (London, 1969) 24ff. For the usual interpretation see Charles Seltman, *Greek Coins* (London, 1955 ed.) 124f.

17) Many examples. See Kraay-Hirmer, *Greek Coins*: tetradrachm, c.470-460, no. 83, pl. 28.

18) Marshall, *Catalogue*, no. 1230.

19) Boardman, *Gems and Rings*, fig. 251, pp. 231, 285.

20) Kraay-Hirmer, *Greek Coins*: drachma, c.500, no. 64, pl. 20.

21) J. Frel, *Athens Annals of Archaeology* III (1969); Berlin Painter—fig. 6, p. 385, Eucharides Painter—figs. 2,3, pp. 379, 381.

for the head and feet of the creature, allowing the artist to gloss over the problem of exactly how the real animal looked. Its body is given texture by the same technique of gouges which can serve as scales (no. 10) or feathers (no. 7) depending upon their owner. Once again the artist has placed the animal so as to fill the format of the bezel as efficiently as possible. This concern is probably the reason its legs and feet are so large in relation to its torso.

9. 72.AI.36.2 Silver. Diameter: 2.275 cm. Weight: 4.75 g. Reclining lion in profile, facing right. Hatched border surrounds bezel face though the lion's fore and hind legs overlap it.

The lion's body is quite fully modeled. Three parallel curving lines often used by Archaic artists to represent ribs, here look more like folds of skin and help give roundness to the animal's chest. The ring lion is comparable in several respects to a lion on a late sixth century gem in New York.²² On both gouged stipples all over the neck represent mane, while a row of bumps running along their spines, apparently also meant to be mane, continues to the base of the tail. They each have similarly shaped rectangular legs and blunt paws. The head of the ring lion is, however, much more leonine than that on the gem where the beast is still rather panther-like.²³

10. 72.AI.36.12 Silver. Diameter: 2.223 cm. Weight: 3.1 g. Seated griffin facing left who slightly overlaps hatched border surrounding bezel face. The ring was once broken and then repaired in a diagonal area across the bezel.

This monster possesses all the characteristics of the griffin type standard in Archaic Greek art: a prominent knob on his forehead, a large, beaked mouth with lolling tongue, and a big pointed ear. He is unlike the standard type, however, in apparently not having a wing. This peculiarity may be simply the result of damage to the ring face in this area. Griffins do not appear on Archaic or Classical coins from Magna Grecia, nor are they particularly common on gems.

11. 72.AI.36.9 Silver. Diameter: 2.054 Weight: 2.15 g. Crouching animal, probably a griffin, facing left. Hatched border around face of bezel. Surface badly worn and corroded.

The animal here crouches with its forequarters on the ground, while its hindparts are raised and its tail flies out from its body. The body was once covered with gouges,

now only faintly visible. The head of the creature is rather long and pointed, suggesting a beak, while three lines streaming out from the neck may have represented locks of hair. His beak and long curls make it very likely that this animal was part of the class of "Phoenician" or Near Eastern griffins who differ from the Archaic Greek type in having more pointed faces, long curls, and in lacking ears or forehead knobs.

12. 72.AI.36.13 Silver. Diameter: 2.175 cm. Weight: 2.7 g. The center of the bezel face surrounded by a hatched border contains a curious device consisting of two concentric arcs from the top of which short lines radiate. The ring is extremely thin and has been broken in three places.

Though the device is extremely schematic and carelessly incised, it suggests the rising (or setting) sun or possibly an eyelid with lashes. The latter seems the more likely suggestion particularly if one can assume an apotropaic function.²⁴

13. 72.AI.36.6 Silver. Diameter: 2.123 cm. Weight: 2.1 g. A hatched border surrounds the face of the bezel. It bears a representation of a frontal human torso to either side of which there is a horse's head in profile. Surface badly corroded.

The image is probably meant to represent Helios in his chariot. There are a series of fine parallel lines between the figure and the right horse which must represent rays of sunlight. Helios in his chariot is a subject which first appears in art during the last decade of the sixth century.²⁵ Representations most comparable to ours occur on vases rather than coins. Thus, for example, an amphora in Vienna by the Gela Painter provides an explanation for the round disc with a central dot which replaces the charioteer's head on the ring. The vase shows Helios bearing the sun, a disc with a central dot. Apparently, in order to adapt the subject for the small field of the bezel the artist simply replaced the god's head with the solar disc including its central dot. The bumpy ridge beneath the ring horses may be either ocean waves or, as on the Vienna vase, the bowl of Helios.²⁶ Unlike vase depictions of Helios the horses on the ring do not seem to be winged, and they definitely face outward rather than toward their driver.

Two other pieces of silver jewelry, a bracelet and a hair ring, were found with the finger rings. They are primarily of archeological interest being simply made and not especially attractive.

22) Richter, *Catalogue*, no. 51, pl. 9.

23) Boardman, *Archaic Greek Gems* (London, 1968) no. 407, p. 128f.

24) Non-figural, purely geometric decoration does exist on such rings. Two rings with small concentric circles decorating their bezels were found in excavations at Selinus, but there the circles are very small,

neatly drawn, and suggest an inexpensive substitute for inlaid metallic studs or pins. Boardman, *Antike Kunst*, F20 and F21, illustrated in *Mon.Ant.* XXXII (1927) fig. 143, p. 343.

25) Konrad Schauenburg, *Helios* (Berlin, 1955) n. 40, p. 50.

26) Schauenburg, *Helios*, fig. 22, p. 44.




1 Lion (palmette)



2 Eagle and dolphin



3a Ketos



3b Ketos ring seen from above



4 Lion (stud)



5 Lobster



6 Lobster (with hole)



7 Rooster



8 Crocodile



9 Lion (tongue lolling, facing right)



10 Griffin (diagonal break)



15 Hair ring



11 Griffin



12 Eyelash



13 Helios



14 Bracelet

14. 72.AI.36.14 Spiral bracelet. Silver. Length: 73 cm. Weight: 63 g. The bracelet is composed of a thin strip of silver, rounded on its outer surface and flat on the inner, which terminates in serpents' heads. Three small ridged metal bands have been bent at even intervals around each end of the bracelet. The snake heads are rather crudely rendered. At each end the bracelet thickens and is pierced in what would be the center of the snake's skull by a squarish hole. There are incised eyes on either edge of the terminals, and scales created by u-shaped gouges cover the surface up to the third metal band.

Spiral serpent bracelets of various types are very popular from the fourth century into the Roman period. Though the Getty example is much less elegant than many of the later bracelets, it attests to the antiquity of the type. A similar bracelet is worn by an archaic goddess of c.500 on a terracotta plaque found at Gela and now in Oxford.²⁷

15. 72.AI.36.15 Spiral hair ring. Silver. Length: 12.1 cm. Weight: 12.4 g. A rounded tube of silver formed into a single helix and terminating in serpent heads. The snake heads have been modeled so that they project from the spiral band. Besides incised eyes, the only other elaboration is the stippled surface of the heads and the v-shaped channels marking the join between head and spiral.

The ring was surely meant to be worn as a hair ornament, probably entwined in curls above the ear.²⁸ Rings of this sort with more elaborate finials are fairly common. Here the snake heads may have been suggested either by the spiral form of the ring itself or possibly adapted from bracelets such as no. 14.

Elizabeth Trimble Buckley
J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu

27) Illustrated in *Enciclopedia dell'Arte Antica* (Rome, 1960) III, fig. 995, p. 802.

28) G. Becatti, *Oreficerie antiche dalle minoniche alle barbariche* (Rome, 1955) no. 292, p. 183.

The first great collection of classical marbles in England was that assembled by Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel and Surrey (1585-1646). Known as the "Arundel Marbles," they were housed during the collector's lifetime in a gallery constructed for the purpose in the grounds of Arundel House in London, between the Strand and the Thames. The story of the piecemeal dispersal of the collection after the Earl's death has been told by A. Michaelis (1882) and D. E. L. Haynes (1968).¹ A few remnants of the collection, however, remained on the site and came to light during redevelopment in September 1972.² The most imposing piece is a sculptured slab from the frieze of a Roman building (fig. 1).

The slab, of a bluish-grey, coarse-grained marble, now measures 1.46 m. in length; the left end is well preserved, with *anathyrosis*, but the right is broken off. The lower bed is also damaged, but the upper surface and the back remain, giving a thickness of approximately 0.60 m. and a preserved height of 0.65 m.

The face of the slab is decorated with a frieze of alternating Medusa-heads and consoles: two heads survive together with two consoles and traces of a third at the right. The left console is flush with the edge of the block. The Medusas are of the familiar type with snakes both in the hair and knotted under the chin, and with wings crowning the coiffure, the wings surviving only on the left head. The hair is modelled in bold curls, deeply drilled; the pupils of the eyes are also drilled, the irises incised. Underneath the heads are curly tendrils that spring from the acanthus leaves below the consoles. The consoles themselves have volutes at the top and are divided vertically into three sections, rather like triglyphs, with a kind of overlapping scale pattern on the central section. Below the frieze is a triple moulding, actually the architrave crown, which together with at least part of the upper fascia of the architrave itself was cut from the same block. The upper moulding is badly damaged, but seems to be a cavetto with palmette ornament; below it are an ovolo with egg-and-dart and a half-round with bead-and-reel. On the upper fascia of the architrave are traces of an inscription, first noticed by Dr. V. M. Strocka. Only the tops of the letters survive, roughly cut

but with large serifs:

] T I I

Friezes of this type with alternating heads and consoles are known on Roman temples of Hadrianic and Antonine date, but this block seems to belong to a frieze hitherto unknown. The interest aroused by its rediscovery led to the recognition of two fragments of another frieze of the same type.

1. London, British Museum, Register no. 1864.2-20.4, Cat. no. 2334. Marble fragment with head of Medusa in relief (fig. 2). In the hair, wings and confronted snakes; the snakes' tails are knotted under the chin. The pupils of the eyes are deeply cut, the irises incised. At the top of the block is a flat fascia, 6 cm. high, separated from a plain, quarter-round moulding by a shallow groove. Below the head are traces of acanthus leaves and scrolls, largely cut away. A short stretch of *anathyrosis* above the break at the right shows that this was the end of the slab. The other side has been trimmed down, but a trace of the console remains. The cutting of the bottom face is modern. Height, as preserved, 50.5 cm.; width, as preserved, 35.5 cm.; thickness 20 cm. overall (depth of relief 7 cm., thickness of wall 13 cm.).

From the Strangford Collection, and said to have been found at Cydonia in Crete. A. H. Smith, *Catalogue of Sculpture in the Department of Greek and Roman Antiquities, British Museum* iii (1904) no. 2334 (listed as a fragment from a sarcophagus).

2. Oslo, Nasjonalgalleriet, Cat. no. 107. Marble fragment with head of Medusa in relief, virtually a twin to the London head except that some of the hair is curled in the opposite direction. The remains of the acanthus leaves below are rather more extensive. Height 52.2 cm.; width, as preserved, 39.7 cm.; thickness 19.5 cm. (dimensions taken from the Catalogue).

S. Eitrem, *Griechische Reliefs und Inschriften im Kunstmuseum zu Kristiania (Christiania Videnskabs-Selskabs Forhandlinger for 1909, No. 9)* p. 14, no. 10, with vignette on p. 3. Id., *Antikksamlingen, Nasjonal-*

I should like to record my gratitude to Mr. J. Paul Getty and to Dr. Jif Frel for the opportunity to share in this tribute to Bernard Ashmole; to His Grace the Duke of Norfolk, E.M., K.G., to the Trustees of the British Museum, to the London Museum and to the Nasjonalgalleriet, Oslo, for photographs and kind permission to publish them; to the friends and colleagues mentioned specifically in the text and notes; and to the following for help of various kinds: Mrs. Philippa Glanville, John Harris, D.E.L. Haynes, R. Merrifield and Francis W. Steer.

D. E. L. Haynes, "The Arundel Marbles," *Archaeology* 21 (1968) pp. 85 ff. and 206 ff. For later discoveries of Arundel Marbles by Haynes, see "The Fawley Court Relief," *Apollo*, July 1972, pp. 6 ff.; "A Pergamon Relief from Henley-on-Thames," *Antiquity* 46 (1972) pp. 54 ff.; "Alte Funde neu entdeckt," *Archäologischer Anzeiger*, 1972, pp. 737 ff.; and "The Arundel 'Homerus' Rediscovered," elsewhere in this volume.

2) An account of the rescue excavation that took place during redevelopment, with an appendix by the present author on the classical marbles found in 1972, will appear in *Transactions of the London and Middlesex Archaeological Society* 25 (1974).

1) A. Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain* (1882) pp. 6 ff.



1 Sculptured slab from the frieze of a Roman building. Courtesy of London Museum.



2 Fragment with head of Medusa, London



3 Fragment with head of Medusa, Oslo



4 Sarcophagus with Medusa heads. J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, 72.AA.152

galleriet (Oslo 1927) 43 b. *Nasjonalgalleriet, Katalog over Skulptur og Kunstindustri* (Oslo 1952) no. 107.

Although the *Katalog* states that the provenience is unknown, Eitrem in 1909 stated that the fragment was from Smyrna, and this has been confirmed by Oscar Thue, Principal Keeper at the Nasjonalgalleriet. The apparent discrepancy in the proveniences of the two fragments is probably to be explained by a mistake in the records of the Strangford Collection. Dr. R. A. Higgins has kindly informed me that in his experience the proveniences recorded there are unreliable. There seems no reason to doubt that both fragments came from Smyrna.

Eitrem correctly recognised that the Oslo fragment was architectural, and its companion-piece in London should be removed from the list of sarcophagus-fragments. A reasonable conjecture can now be made about the form of the ornaments that have been chiselled away, and the crowning moulding seems unsuitable for a sarcophagus.³ At the same time this moulding is unlike those that normally crown Medusa-head friezes, and in view of the block's extreme thinness its precise function must remain in doubt.

The evidence available at present suggests that this type of frieze with alternating Medusa-heads and consoles was invented in Asia Minor during the early years of the second century AD. Its forerunners in the Late Hellenistic and Early Imperial periods have been studied by Weigand,⁴ and need not be rehearsed in detail here. One example, however, is of particular interest: the frieze of the temple of Jupiter at Baalbek.⁵ Here the consoles spring from upright acanthus leaves and are surmounted alternately by protomes of bulls and of lions. In horizontal spacing they correspond with the modillions of the cornice, but they are separated from them by an ovolo bed-moulding and a row of dentils. The central upright member of the console is decorated with rows of overlapping laurel leaves like those around the pulvinus of fourth-century and later Ionic capitals. This motif explains the origin of the scale-pattern in the corresponding position on the Arundel frieze-block. At Baalbek too the architrave and the frieze are carved from the same block.

At Baalbek the lion- and bull-protomes themselves satisfy the need for sculptural ornament in the frieze,

and the intervals between the consoles are decorated simply with looped garlands and knotted taeniae. The earliest example of the insertion of Medusa-heads between the consoles⁶ seems to be the frieze of the Trajanum at Pergamon, begun during the later years of Trajan's reign and completed under Hadrian.⁷ Here the architrave and frieze are separate courses, each with its own crowning moulding. There are therefore no mouldings at the foot of the frieze-block, although it carries its own ovolo crown. The mouldings that crown the architrave correspond in form to those on the Arundel block.

The consoles of the Trajanum are surmounted by pairs of small acanthus leaves that overlap the crowning ovolo and help to emphasize the connection between the consoles and the modillions of the cornice, which now project immediately above them without any intermediary features like dentils. In the absence of protomes like those at Baalbek, the consoles and the acanthus leaves from which they rise together occupy the full height of the frieze. The Medusa-heads, however, fill only the upper half of the interstices: below them are volutes that spring from the acanthus leaves at the base of the consoles. The combination of acanthus leaves and volutes, which almost touch their neighbours under the Medusa-heads, gives a rather unsatisfactory impression of a row of Corinthian pilaster capitals.

This effect is avoided in the frieze of Temple N 1 at Side, which has been dated around the middle of the second century.⁸ Here the Medusa-heads are proportionately larger and there are now no volutes below them. The acanthus leaves, however, form a wider and more convex bell at the foot of the console, and extra leaves spring from the base to occupy the space below the heads. In structure this is like the Trajanum frieze, the frieze-block including its own crowning ovolo but not the architrave-crown below.

In the theatre at Side a pleasing adaptation of this type of frieze was employed in the upper order of the scaenae frons.⁹ Theatrical masks replace the Medusa-heads, and extra volutes spring from the bell of acanthus leaves to flank the consoles. The latter are reduced in height, so that they no longer overlap the crowning ovolo, and they have lost their apparent function of supporting the modillions. Of course the whole entablature is on a

3) For this observation I am indebted to the late Professor Donald Strong, who was characteristically generous with help and advice when I first began to study these fragments.

4) *Jdl* 29 (1914) pp. 52 ff.

5) T. Wiegand, *Baalbek I* (1921) pp. 59 ff., pl. 23.

6) For the general history of the Medusa-head as an architectural ornament, see E. Buschor, *Medusa Rondanini* (1958) p. 26.

7) *Altertümer von Pergamon* V, 2, H. Stiller, *Das Traianum* (1895) pp. 20 ff., pls. 10 and 12. D. E. Strong, *PBSR* 21 (1953) pp. 131 ff., fig. 4.

8) Arif Müfid Mansel, *Vorläufiger Bericht über die Ausgrabungen in Side im Jahre 1947* (1951) pp. 16-22. Strong, *PBSR* 21 (1953) p. 133, fig. 5. Mansel, *Die Ruinen von Side* (1963) pp. 80 ff., fig. 61.

9) Mansel, *Ruinen*, pp. 134 ff., fig. 110.

smaller scale, with architrave and frieze cut from the same block.

The consoles of the Trajaneum were spaced rather closely, with the horizontal interval only about four-fifths of the height of the frieze. In the temple at Side the heads are proportionately larger: they not only occupy more of the available height, as already noted, but also cause a corresponding increase in the horizontal interval, which is now almost equal to the height of the frieze. The Arundel block takes this tendency a stage further, with the horizontal interval now greater than the height of the frieze. Indeed the Medusa-heads account for almost the total height of the frieze, with room below them only for a couple of tendrils. The space between the consoles is now roughly square like a Doric metope. If this change in proportions truly reflects a chronological sequence, the Arundel frieze ought to be dated rather later than the middle of the second century. Such a date would be consistent with the style of the sculpture and the extensive use of the drill already described. The form of the mouldings also suggests an Antonine rather than an earlier date.¹⁰

The London-Oslo frieze ought to be earlier than this. The wings are somewhat triangular in shape and are raised above the head, as on the Trajaneum. The surviving traces of the console indicate that the space between the consoles was an upright oblong, perhaps closer in proportion to those on Temple N 1 at Side than to the other examples. The blandly classicizing style of the faces themselves further suggest a Hadrianic date.

It has been established that the fragments in London and Oslo probably originated in Smyrna, and the same provenience seems likely for the Arundel block. Shortly after its rediscovery Sir John Summerson, Director of Sir John Soane's Museum in Lincoln's Inn Fields, realised that it is mentioned in marginal notes by Inigo Jones in his copy of Barbaro's edition of Vitruvius, now in the library at Chatsworth.¹¹ In one place Jones writes of "my dessigne of the Antike freeze wth gorgons heedes Ar: Ho: whear thear are cartotzi with leaves in the frees as y^e triglifies aure in y^e dorrike." This is clearly a description of the frieze-block, which remained on the Arundel House site from Jones's day to our own. In another place Jones mentions "...thes mutoli insted of Triglifies as in the corronice y^t cam from Smyrna, as was of ye temble of pallas, by the gorgons heades bee-

twene the mutoli." Jones's ascription of the block to a temple of Athena is no more than antiquarian guesswork, but his mention of Smyrna is useful. Unequivocal though it is, however, his statement only proves that Smyrna was the port of origin. Nonetheless the weight of the block and the difficulty of moving it overland (doubtless reasons for its remaining at Arundel House when most of the other marbles were removed) suggest that it may have come to light in the environs of Smyrna itself. Unfortunately Smyrna is one of those sites that now have little to show for their importance in Roman times, and it is at present impossible to identify the building for which the Arundel frieze-block was made.¹²

Epilogue

The block's short but not undistinguished career in the history of English art and architecture of the seventeenth century has been discussed by John Harris.¹³ It was drawn by John Webb and painted by van Dyck; it served as an architectural model for Inigo Jones. Left behind at Arundel House, it was lost under later buildings and seems to make only one further appearance in the record before its recent rediscovery. In 1757 James Theobald wrote that a sarcophagus was to be seen in the cellar of Mr. James Adamson, who lived in one of the streets that then occupied the Arundel House site.¹⁴ No sarcophagus has been found there, and it seems likely that the "sarcophagus" in question was in fact our frieze-block. Embedded in the foundations of a house with only its face visible, its solidity would not be evident. It could easily be mistaken for a decorative sarcophagus with Medusa-heads, of the type represented in Mr. Getty's collection at Malibu by an example formerly at Lowther Castle (72 AA 152).¹⁵

Brian F. Cook
British Museum

10) For this observation I am indebted to Dr. V. M. Strocka.

11) John Harris, "The Link between a Roman second-century sculptor, Van Dyck, Inigo Jones and Queen Henrietta Maria," *Burlington Magazine* CXV (Number 845, August 1973) pp. 526 ff., figs. 50-55.

12) It can hardly belong to the Corinthian temple of probable Hadrianic or Antonine date that Prokesh Ritter von Osten saw in ruins near Smyrna in the early nineteenth century: to judge by the size of the

columns (lower diameter "6 feet"), this was on a larger scale; *Jahrbücher der Literatur* 68 (1834, Oct.-Dec.) pp. 62 ff.

13) See note 11: Harris illustrates the relevant painting and drawings.

14) Letter of 10 May 1757, C. Howard, *Historical Anecdotes of the Howard Family* (1769) pp. 91 ff.; Haynes, *Archaeology* 21 (1968) p. 208.

15) Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles*, p. 494, no. 49; J. Paul Getty Museum, Malibu, 72.AA.152.

Vor einigen Jahren erwarb J. Paul Getty im Kunsthandel eine marmorne Hermenbüste des Demosthenes, die in der im Spätherbst 1973 von der Universität Northridge veranstalteten Ausstellung griechischer und römischer Porträts dem Publikum präsentiert wurde¹ und jetzt als Dauer-Leihgabe (L73AA5) in Saal 207 des neuen Antikenmuseums in Malibu steht. Die Büste (Abb. 1-5)² ist unterlebensgross, ihre Gesamthöhe beträgt 38,4cm, doch ist nur der aus feinkörnigem graustichigem (kleinasiatischem ?) Marmor gearbeitete Kopf mit dem Hals (insgesamt 20cm hoch) antik; die schlichte nackte Herme aus hellerem Marmor, auf der er aufsass, und die links unten den Namen des Dargestellten in griechischen Buchstaben trägt, ist hingegen neu³. Die Nase war zur Gänze und mitsamt dem mittleren und linken Teil der schnurrbartbedeckten Oberlippe weggebrochen und ist jetzt abgenommen. Ansonsten hat der Kopf nur geringfügige Beschädigungen: Der linke Backenknochen ist geprellt und durch seichte Absplitterungen verletzt, beide Augenbrauen sind bestossen, die rechte ist ebenso wie das untere Lid des rechten Auges modern überarbeitet. Abgesplittert ist ein Stück der Locke vor dem linken Ohr, dessen Leiste bestossen ist, und eine Locke an der rechten Seite des Hinterkopfes. Eine kleine Stossspur sitzt in der Stirnmitte unter dem Ansatz der Haare.

Der Porträtkopf war trotz der abgebrochenen Nase eindeutig als der des Demosthenes identifizierbar. Die markanten Züge des grossen attischen Redners sind durch gesicherte Wiederholungen seines Bildnisses wohl bekannt: Ein etwa 60-jähriger Mann mit dem Ausdruck nachdenklichen Ernstes. Die von tiefen Furchen durchquerte breite Stirn ist gewölbt und hoch, Stirnhöcker und Stirnbein treten kahl hervor. Am Vorderkopf liegen die nach vorne gestrichenen Haare in dünnerer Schicht auf, während sie—in kurze sichelförmige Locken von natürlicher Ordnung gegliedert—den Schädel sonst noch in vollem Wuchs bedecken und bis in den Nacken hinabreichen⁴. Die Brauenbögen sind zusammengezogen und beschatten die Oberlider der eng

beieinanderstehenden Augen, deren Äpfel nach unten abgeschrägt sind. Die inneren Augenwinkel sind neben dem hohen Steg des Nasenbeines tief eingesenkt, von den äusseren strahlen Krähfüsse in Bogenlinien nach oben. Unter den Augen Tränensäcke, die Haut ist welk, die Backenknochen treten vor. Die Wangen sind erschlafft, von den Nasenflügeln führt beiderseits je eine Furche zu den Mundwinkeln hin. Ein dichter Schnurrbart bedeckt die Oberlippe und geht entlang der stark eingetieften Ecken des Mundes, der dünnlippig und leicht verzogen ist, in den kurzen Vollbart über. Dieser besteht aus spitzzulaufenden flockigen Haarbündeln, die in abgestuften Reihen die Kinnladen eng umschliessen. Die Barthaare wachsen seitlich ziemlich tief in die Wangen und vor den Ohren bis zum Ansatz der Schläfenhaare hinauf. Das Untergesicht ist schwächer gebildet als die kräftig gebaute obere Gesichtshälfte. Die Seitenansichten zeigen, dass der Unterkiefer zurückweicht und die kurze Unterlippe ganz unter die Oberlippe geschoben ist; aus tiefer Kehlung springt das gerundete Kinn vor⁵, das von vorne eigentümlicherweise eher länglich gebildet erscheint.

Der breite Hals⁶ ist an der linken Seite glatt, an der rechten hingegen treten Schwellungen hervor, durchzogen von parallelen Rillen, die vom Nacken schräg nach vorne verlaufen. Ein solches Faltengeschiebe an der rechten Halsseite entsteht durch Wenden und Senken des Kopfes nach dieser Seite hin. Der Kopf der Statuen in Rom, Vatikan⁷ und in Kopenhagen⁸ ist zwar nur wenig geneigt⁹, aber alle mitsamt dem Hals erhaltenen Wiederholungen des Kopfes allein weisen übereinstimmend mit unserer Replik in Malibu und meist ebenso eingehend in der Wiedergabe¹⁰ bei straffer linker Halsseite tief eingeschnittene Querrillen auf der rechten auf. Selbst bei den Hermenkopien in München¹¹ und in Rom, S.Cecilia in Trastevere¹², deren Kopf fast gerade auf den Schultern sitzt, ist der Hals in gleicher Weise modelliert.

Augenfälliger jedoch und zugleich das charakteristi-

1) Greek and Roman Portraits from the J. Paul Getty Museum, October 16-November 11, 1973 Fine Arts Gallery. California State University at Northridge. S.15 No.7 (ohne Abb.).

2) Photographien, die Angaben über Erwerb, Material, Abmessungen etc. übermittelte mir freundlich Herr Prof. Dr. Jiří Frel, dem ich für die Überlassung der Publikation verbindlichst danke.

3) Ob der Kopf auch ursprünglich auf einer Herme etwa dieser Art und Grösse angebracht war, lässt sich freilich nicht mehr feststellen, ist aber irrelevant. Dass er zu einer Statue gehörte, ist weniger wahrscheinlich.

4) Am Wirbel unserer Replik bilden sie ein kompliziertes Seesternmotiv, darunter sind die hier nur leicht gekrümmten Haarbüschel etwas schematisch in drei Stufen angeordnet; links führt aus der obersten Stufe eine langgezogene Strähne bis zum Ohr hin.

5) Hier weniger schwer, fast hängend gebildet als bei den meisten anderen Repliken.—Vgl. Gisela M.A.Richter, *The Portraits of the Greeks II*.(1965) Figs.1401, 1404, 1410-12, 1413 u.a.

6) Er ist nicht bei allen Wiederholungen so kurz und gedrungen.

7) Richter a.O. No.1 Figs.1397, 1404-6.



8) Richter a.O. No.32 Figs.1398-1400, 1401-2.

9) K.Schefold, *Die Bildnisse der antiken Dichter, Redner und Denker* (1943) S.106 schreibt allerdings: "mit scharfer Wendung nach unten blickend".


10) Kaum ausgeprägt beim vorzüglichen Kopf in Oxford (Richter a.O. No.27 Figs.1464-67), von dem ich annehmen möchte, dass er von einer statuarischen Replik herrührt.


11) Richter a.O. No.36 Fig.1481.

12) Richter a.O. No.8 Figs.1413-15.




1-4 Kopf des Demosthenes, Malibu. J. Paul Getty Museum, L73.AA.5






5 Büste des Demosthenes, Malibu, im ergänzten Zustand



6-7 Abbildung, Kopf des Demosthenes in Boston, Museum of Fine Arts. Photo courtesy Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (at right)



scheste Merkmal der Physiognomie des Demosthenes ist das im Profil so deutlich in Erscheinung tretende Zurückweichen des Unterkiefers gegenüber dem Oberkiefer. Angesichts dieser leichten Anomalie der Mundkieferbildung erinnert man sich unwillkürlich an die offenbar angeborenen Sprachschwierigkeiten bzw. -fehler, *impedimenta naturae* (Cic. de orat. I.260), mit denen Demosthenes, wie überliefert, zu kämpfen hatte: Seine Aussprache war undeutlich¹³ und er lispelte, so dass er das Rho, den Anfangsbuchstaben der Kunst, der er sich verschrieb, nicht aussprechen konnte¹⁴. Visconti, Bernoulli, Michaelis und andere¹⁵ haben auch wirklich einen ursächlichen Zusammenhang zwischen der zurückweichenden Bildung des Unterkiefers und den genannten Sprachmängeln angenommen; A. Furtwängler¹⁶ meinte sogar, sie wären schon durch die Schiefheit des Mundes bedingt gewesen. Nach dem Befund der modernen Kieferorthopädie¹⁷ jedoch verursacht eine Distallage der Unterlippe und des Kinnes, wie sie in den Demosthenes-Bildnissen zur Darstellung gebracht ist, keine Artikulationsschwierigkeiten. Solche treten erst bei schwerer Distallage auf, die aber hier nicht vorliegt, und die durch die von Demosthenes durchgeführten Übungen (lautes Rezitieren von Versen oder Reden mit Steinchen im Mund und im Bergaufgehen¹⁸) wohl auch nicht zu beheben gewesen wären¹⁹. Noch weniger ist ein nur leicht verzogener Mund²⁰ als das äussere Merkmal für Sprachfehler zu werten. Es muss demnach eine zusätzliche, äusserlich nicht feststellbare zentral bedingte, psychisch-nervöse Störung bestanden haben, die Demosthenes mit äusserster Willenskraft in unablässigem, rigorosem Training überwand.

In dem grundlegenden Sammelwerk "The Portraits of

the Greeks" (I-III, 1965) von Gisela M. A. Richter²¹ sind 45 gesicherte—und 12 zweifelhafte—rundplastische Bildnisse des Demosthenes erfasst und zusammengestellt²². Im Supplement-Heft (1972) ist als 46. ein i.J. 1965 in Rom, im Bereich des Lateran gefundener Kopf aufgenommen²³. Seither sind innerhalb von kaum drei Jahren (1971-73) nicht weniger als sechs (!) weitere rundplastische Repliken²⁴ des Demosthenes-Bildnisses aufgetaucht bzw. bekannt geworden:

1. Eine Kopie der ganzen Gestalt in der über das natürliche Mass hinausgehobenen Grösse des Originals²⁵—neben der Vatikanischen und der Kopenhagener Statue nunmehr die dritte, die auf uns gekommen ist—steht als Leihgabe in der im April 1972 wiedereröffneten Glyptothek München²⁶. Leider fehlt der Kopf dieser gut und frisch gearbeiteten Statue, die Hände bis über die Gelenke hinauf, der rechte Fuss und der linke Vorfuss.

2. Ein Demosthenes-Kopf, der zum Einlassen in eine Statue zugerichtet ist, befindet sich in der Antikensammlung des Schlosses Klein-Gliencke bei Potsdam²⁷. Fr. W. Goethert, der Bearbeiter des Katalogs dieser im vorigen Jahrhundert zusammengetragenen Privatsammlung, die in der archäologischen Forschung bisher kaum beachtet wurde²⁸, schreibt mit Recht, das Stück zähle zu den Beispielen, die den Typus am besten überliefern. Das von innen heraus gestaltete, metallisch knapp modellierte Antlitz ist besonders ausdrucksstark und intensiv in seiner Aussage. Der Erhaltungszustand ist gut, nur die Nase ist unterhalb des Beines weggebrochen²⁹. Die scharf konturierte Unterlippe ist breit.

3. Ein in Albanien, in Museum von Apollonia verwahrter Demosthenes-Kopf³⁰ ist aus dem Boden der alten

13) Plut. Dem.6 und 11.

14) Cic. de div. II 46,96 und de orat. I 260. Plut. Dem. 11.

15) E.Q. Visconti, Iconogr. gr. I. (1811) cap. VI. S. 256; —J.J. Bernoulli, Die erhaltenen Bildnisse berühmter Griechen (1877) S. 16; —A. Schaefer, Demosthenes und seine Zeit I² (1885) S. 331; —A. Michaelis, Die Bildnisse des Demosthenes, in: Schaefer a.O. III² (1887) S. 418; —Fr. Blass, Die attische Beredsamkeit III² (1893. Neudruck 1962) S. 23f. u.a.

16) Beschreibung der Glyptothek München² (1910) Nr. 292 S. 317.

17) Die Auskunft verdanke ich Oberarzt Dr. Kurt Schroll, Universitätszahnklinik Graz (Vorstand: Prof. Dr. H. Köle).

18) Cic. de orat. I 261; —Plut. Dem. 11. Vgl. auch Quintilian, inst. orat. XI 3,54.

19) Damit fällt auch der event. Einwand, dass in Wirklichkeit eine stärkere Missbildung vorhanden gewesen sein könnte, die der Künstler aber in gemildeter Form wiedergab. War hingegen das Bildnis des Demosthenes nur eine "Konstruktion" (siehe darüber im folgenden), so wollte der Künstler möglicherweise in der dargestellten Mundkieferbildung die Sprachschwierigkeiten, von denen er Kunde hatte, andeuten.

20) Bei vielen Repliken kaum merklich.

21) Siehe Anm. 5)

22) A.O. S. 216ff. No. 1-43, No. 46-47. —No. 44-45 sind Basen mit der Namensaufschrift "Demosthenes", deren Figuren fehlen. —

Zweifelhafte Bildnisse: S. 221. Dazu noch (S. 221ff.) kleine Reliefs, Statuetten, Gemmen und Münzen.

23) The Portraits of the Greeks. Supplement (1972) S. 7 No. 3a Figs. 1412a-c.

24) Ein unpubliziertes Reliefbild des Demosthenes im Nationalmuseum zu Praha (J. Bouzek-M. Dufková-K. Kurz, Antický portrét. Katalog. Národní muzeum v Praze, 1972. S. 28 Nr. 15. ohne Abb.) blieb hier unberücksichtigt.

25) Richter a.O. gibt die Höhe der Vatikanischen Statue (No. 1) mit 2,07m, Kopfhöhe: 27,9cm, die der Kopenhagener (No. 32) mit 2,02m (ohne Plinthe: 1,92m, Kopfhöhe: 28cm) an.

26) D. Ohly, Glyptothek München. Griechische und römische Skulpturen (1972) S. 72f.

27) Fr. W. Goethert, Katalog der Antikensammlung des Prinzen Carl von Preussen im Schloss zu Klein-Gliencke bei Potsdam (1972) S. 8 Mr. 50 Taf. 24-25. H=33cm.

28) Vgl. Goethert a.O. im Vorwort S. IX.

29) Anscheinend war sie ergänzt und die Ergänzung ist nachträglich wieder abgenommen worden.

30) M. Korkuti, Shqiperia Arkeologjike (1971). Taf. 91. Ohne Angabe von Massen und event. Restaurierungen. Rez. in SOF 32, 1973 S. 488ff. (E. Diez).

griechischen Stadt Süd-Illyriens zutage gekommen, jener *magna urbs et gravis*³¹ Apollonia, die auch Pflegestätte der Rhetorik war³², und deren hohe Kultur bis in das 3.nachchristl.Jahrhundert blühte³³. Nach der speziellen Gravierung der Augensterne ist die Replik des Kopfes, dessen Hals weggebrochen ist, Ende des 2. oder Anfang des 3.Jhs. geschaffen worden. Im Gegensatz zu dem Kopf in Klein-Glienice ist hier das Bronze-original in den Marmorstil übersetzt. Wirkungsvoll kontrastiert die Glätte der Haut mit dem rauh belassenen Kopf- und Barthaar. Untergesicht und Kinn sind schwächlich gebildet. Die dünne Unterlippe ist eingezogen und verschwindet unter der oberen Zahnreihe.

4. Nicht mit Sicherheit eruierbar ist die Herkunft eines Demosthenes-Kopfes im Landesmuseum Joanneum in Graz, Österreich.³⁴ Die relativ gut erhaltene Replik³⁵ weicht von den anderen in der Bildung der Haare ab: Über den kahlen Oberkopf sind vereinzelte dünne, lange Strähnen nach vorne gestrichen. Eine Frisur, die individueller und realistischer erscheint als das Gelock, das freilich alle Demosthenes-Köpfe übereinstimmend, also wohl dem Original entsprechend wiedergeben. Verändert ist auch die Augenpartie und damit der Ausdruck des Bildnisses: Die Augen sind nicht wie sonst eher klein, manchmal sogar verkniffen, schmal, tief liegend und beschattet, sondern gross und trotz des gesenkten Blickes voll geöffnet.

5. Ungewiss bleibt auch die Provenienz der Hermenbüste in Malibu, die eine verkleinerte und auch sonst bescheidene, anspruchslose Nachbildung des grossen Bronzeoriginals repräsentiert. Der Kopf ist steil und kaum nach seiner rechten Seite geneigt auf die neue Büste gesetzt. Der Schädel ist hier breit gebaut, ebenso das Gesicht mit den starken Backenknochen und den eckigen Kinnladen. Die Gesichtshälften sind ungleich, das linke Auge sitzt viel höher als das rechte. Der schief verzogene Mund ist ziemlich gross. Die ergänzte Nase ist kurz, in den Flügeln breit und beinahe auch ein wenig schief³⁶, und zwar divergierend zum Mund. In den etwas summarisch behandelten und verfestigten Zügen, bedingt auch durch die Ergänzungen, tritt ein anderer

Charakterzug in den Vordergrund als etwa in dem Grazer Kopf. Dieser Demosthenes im J. Paul Getty Museum ist weniger von schmerzlicher Resignation erfüllt, sondern eher von verbissener Energie³⁷.

6. Ein Demosthenes-Kopf des Museum of Fine Arts, Boston (Abb. 6-7)³⁸ wurde in der im Oktober 1972 im Brockton Art Center veranstalteten Ausstellung "The Ancient Mediterranean World" erstmalig der Öffentlichkeit zugänglich gemacht³⁹. Er ist als Geschenk an das MFA gelangt⁴⁰, sein Fundort ist unbekannt. Material ist ein feinkristalliner (italischer ?) Marmor. Die Gesamthöhe des Stückes beträgt 19cm, die des Gesichtes allein 13cm, das Original ist also auf etwa die Hälfte reduziert⁴¹. Die kleine Büste mit den schmalen Schulteransätzen war ursprünglich wahrscheinlich auf eine Herme oder auf einen Pfeiler gestellt. Abweichend von allen auf uns gekommenen Wiederholungen in Büstenform, deren beide Schultern nackt sind⁴² oder mit einer Gewandauflage auf der linken Schulter⁴³ versehen—wie dies der Vollfigur mit dem um die Körpermitte geschlungenen Mantel, von dem ein breiter Zipfel über die linke Schulter nach vorne herabfällt, entspricht—sind hier Gewandfalten um die rechte Schulter drapiert.

Der Erhaltungszustand ist leider nicht gut. Die Nase ist weggebrochen, besonders aber hat auch die Oberfläche sehr gelitten, das Gesicht ist über seine gesamte Fläche wie abgeschürft, Schnurr- und Kinnbart verrieben. Die weniger verschliffene linke Kopfseite lässt noch die Güte der Kopistenarbeit erkennen, etwa in der Wiedergabe der dichten Haarlocken, die vom Wirbel ausgehend in natürlichem Wuchs und in lockerer Schichtung aufliegen. Die kurzen Haarlocken des Bartes umschliessen knapp das runde Kinn. Die aus einer tiefen Kehlung aufsteigende Unterlippe ist eingezogen. Das Ohr ist in seinem oberen Teil mit breiter Randleiste und wulstiger Gegenleiste eingentümlich nach vorne gebogen. Diese spezielle Bildung des Ohres weisen—mehr oder minder ausgeprägt—auch die meisten anderen Kopien auf⁴⁴.

Der Kopf ist leicht nach seiner rechten Seite geneigt. Die hohe, bis über das Stirnbein hinauf freie Stirn ist in ihren unteren Teil gebuckelt. Die tief eingesunkenen,

31) Cic. Phil.11,26.

32) G.Fr.Hertzberg, Die Geschichte Griechenlands unter der Herrschaft der Römer. I.(1866) S.434.

33) G.Hirschfeld RE II (1896) Sp.112f.

34) E.Diez, ÖJh 50,1972-73 S. ff. Abb.1-3. —Vielleicht aus Salona, Hauptstadt der Provinz Dalmatia. H=28,8cm.

35) Auch die Nase ist zum Grossteil erhalten.

36) Der linke Flügelknorpel ist ein klein wenig tiefer angesetzt als der rechte, dessen Ansatz noch vorhanden war.

37) Nach Furtwängler a.O. liegt in dem Kopf der Münchener Herme "ein Zug verbissener Energie".

38) Courtesy, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Neg.No. B 20224-5. —Für die Erlaubnis der Publikation bin ich C.C. Vermeule zu Dank verpflichtet sowie auch J.Frel, der sie für mich erwirkte.

39) R.Taylor, The Boston Globe, Oct.6,1972 p.21.

40) Geschenk von Miss Jeannette Brun. —Access.No.1972.899.

41) Etwas kleiner noch als der Kopf im J.Paul Getty Museum.

42) Vgl. Richter a.O. No.6 (Figs.1425-27); No.8 (Figs.1413-15); No.15 (Fig.1428); No.20 (Fig.1429); No.36 (Fig.1481).

43) Vgl. Richter a.O. No.3 (Figs.1410-12); No.9 (Fig.1409); No.12 (Figs. 1438-40); No.13 (Figs.1441-43); No.46 (Figs.1485-88) u.a.

44) Z.B. Richter a.O. No.1 (Fig.1404); No.3 (Figs.1410,1412); No.4

eng beieinanderstehenden Augen sind sehr klein, der Blick ganz in sich gekehrt. Das Antlitz ist—anders als das kraftvolle des Demosthenes in Malibu—länglich schmal, fast zart. Der Mund auffallend klein, die herabgezogenen Winkel dunkel beschattet. Trotz der empfindlichen Beschädigung hat das Bildnis des Demosthenes in dieser hervorragenden Bostoner Replik eine feine Geistigkeit bewahrt und kündigt eindringlich von der "Tragik des Einsamen"⁴⁵.

Ein drittes nach den Staaten gelangtes Demosthenes-Bildnis (Kopf und Hals samt rechtem Schulteransatz), früher in Washington, jetzt im Princeton Art Museum⁴⁶, ist bereits seit längerem bekannt und mehrfach publiziert.

Trotz auffälliger Unterschiedlichkeit keineswegs nur qualitativer Art gehen doch sämtlich Demosthenes-Bildnisse—wie schon E. Q. Visconti⁴⁷, dem wir eine Reihe für die antike Kunstgeschichte wichtiger Entdeckungen verdanken⁴⁸, erkannt hatte—auf ein einziges Original zurück: Auf die i.J.280/79 auf der Agora von Athen, nahe dem Altar der Zwölf Götter errichtete bronzene⁴⁹ Ehren- und Gedächtnisstatue des Demosthenes, als deren Schöpfer der uns sonst nicht bekannte attische Künstler namens Polyuktos überliefert ist⁵⁰. Die Frage, inwieweit das mehr als vier Jahrzehnte nach dem Freitod des Demosthenes geschaffene Bildnis naturgetreu war und sein konnte, lässt sich nicht mit Bestimmtheit beantworten. Für E. Löwy⁵¹ war die polyuktsche Statue, die Persönlichkeit und Schicksal des Mannes abgeschlossen zusammenfasst, eine Konstruktion. A. Hekler⁵² hingegen trat dafür ein, dass die ikonographische Verlässlichkeit trotz der posthumen Entstehung nicht bestritten werden sollte; dem Künstler konnten Porträts aus der Lebenszeit des Demosthenes zur Verfügung stehen. Nach G. Lippold⁵³ muss dem Polyuktos für den realistischen Kopf ein solches authentisches Porträt vorgelegen haben. E. Buschor⁵⁴ wiederum hielt es für sehr unsicher, dass es eine Modellüberlieferung des 42 Jahre zuvor entehrt Gestor-

benen gegeben habe; "um so zuverlässiger ist die Schauung des gesamten vergeblichen Lebenswerkes, des unglücklich gelebten Lebens". W.-H. Schuchhardt⁵⁵ würdigt diese Demosthenes-Statue als ein hervorragendes Beispiel, ja als die Verkörperung einer neuen Epoche, die eine zweite Blüte der Bildniskunst heraufführt. E. Löwy⁵⁶ galt sie als eine der grössten Schöpfungen aller Bildniskunst.

Der Fundort des Kopfes in Malibu und in Boston, wie auch der einiger anderer Repliken, ist unbekannt. Die überwiegende Mehrzahl der Demosthenes-Bildnisse aber stammt nachweislich aus Italien⁵⁷. Und dies hängt unzweifelhaft mit der ausserordentlich hohen Wertschätzung zusammen, die die Redekunst im allgemeinen und Demosthenes im besonderen bei den Römern genoss⁵⁸. Cicero, der auf die Vorrangigkeit der Rhetorik in Rom von frühester Zeit an gegenüber anderen Disziplinen (Dichtkunst, Musik, Geometrie bei den Griechen) hinweist⁵⁹, stellt Demosthenes, den *princeps oratorum*⁶⁰ wiederholt als Vorbild und Ideal⁶¹ hin. Plinius min. bezeichnet Demosthenes gleichfalls ja als sein Vorbild⁶², *norma oratoris et regula*⁶³ und Quintilian in seinem systematischen Lehrbuch der Rhetorik als *paene lex orandi*⁶⁴. Bis ins lateinische Mittelalter wurde Demosthenes mit höchster Achtung als grösster Redner Griechenlands genannt⁶⁵ und sein Ruhm klingt noch in der Gegenwart nach⁶⁶. Der Ruhm freilich nicht allein des Redners; Werner Jaeger sieht in Demosthenes den letzten, sich für Volk, Polis und Freiheit verzehrenden griechischen Menschen⁶⁷.

Erna Diez
Graz

(Fig.1418); No.9 (Fig.1403); No.13 (Fig.1443) u.a.

45) Schefold a.O. (Anm.9).

46) Richter a.O. No.47 Figs.1468-70).

47) A.O. (Anm.15) S.254.

48) A.Rumpf, Archäologie I.(1953) S.63.

49) Plut. Dem.30.

50) Ps.Plut. Vit.X orat. Demosth.847a. —Zu Polyuktos siehe G. Lippold, RE 21 (1952) Sp.1629.

51) Belvedere 12,1928 S.79ff.(S.80).

52) Bildnisse berühmter Griechen³(1962) S.36.

53) A.O. und Griechische Plastik (Handbuck III.,1950) S.302f.

54) Das Porträt (1960) S.117f.

55) Die Epochen der griechischen Plastik (1959) S.116.

56) A.O. S.81.

57) Richter a.O. S.223.

58) Vgl. Richter a.O.: "An eloquent testimony to Demosthenes' popularity in the West in Roman times."

59) Tusc. I 2,3-3,1.

60) Brut.141.

61) Z.B. Orat.110.

62) Ep.I 2,2.

63) Ep.IX 26,8.

64) Inst.orat. X 1,76.

65) V.Buchheit RAC 3(1957) Sp.720.

66) Richter a.O. S.215.

67) Buchheit a.O. Sp.714. —W.Jaeger, Demosthenes. The Origin and Growth of his Policy. Sather Classical Lectures XIII. University of California Press (Berkeley 1938). Deutsch: Demosthenes. Der Staatsmann und sein Werden (1939. Nachdruck 1963). Ders. Paideia 3/2 (1947) S.345ff.: Demosthenes.

Nikosthenic Amphorai: The J. Paul Getty Museum Amphora

There is perhaps no other Greek vase shape which has received as much scholarly abuse as the Nikosthenic amphora. As a Greek adaptation of an Italic shape, critics have delighted in castigating this "un-Greek" shape produced in a Greek workshop.¹ The basic form was produced locally in Etruria, but the product of the Nikosthenic workshop has enough refinements and minor changes that it can only be called a Greek product.² Over the last few decades, a small but growing number of these vases have become part of American collections.³ To this number it is a pleasure to note the rather unique example now in the J. Paul Getty Museum (figs. 1-2).⁴

Inv. no. 68.AE.19. Black-figure Nikosthenic amphora. The vase is complete with the handles broken and repaired; a piece of the foot has been broken and repaired. There is a small restoration in plaster on the foot and the chip on the lip. Ht. 0.31 m.; Diam. at lip 0.127 m.; Diam. at foot 0.113 m.; Greatest diam. 0.181 m.

The shape, typical of the Nikosthenic amphora, exhibits the wide strap handles extending from the lip to the lower part of the shoulder (fig. 3). There are two sets of ridges delineating a band below the shoulder and a high foot. The clay has fired, for the most part, to a light-orange color, with a lighter color on the inside of the handles. The quality of the black glaze varies.

The interior of the neck is glazed; the wide lip has a series of 24 dolphins with heads pointing towards the interior of the vase (fig. 4). Each dolphin is smaller than the one above it. All have an incised line for the nose, an incised circular eye, two semi-circular incised lines marking the back of the head, and two incised lines on the body. The edge of the lip is glazed.

On both sides of the neck, two boxers are in fighting positions, one on each side of a tripod (fig. 5). The tripods are off center and the figures are spread out so that the end figure on each side extends under the handle and comes close to the end of the figure on the opposite side. Added red is used for the hair of all four boxers,

and other details in the scene are indicated by incision. On the exterior of the handles are large tripods. These are similar to the tripods on the neck, but on one an irregular incised pattern has been added to the center leg (fig. 6).

On each side of the shoulder a youth is seated on a folding stool between large eyes (figs. 7-8). *A*. The youth has a short striped garment around his waist bunched together in front. He holds the ends of the eyebrows of the large eyes in each hand. The signature: ΝΙΚΟΣΘΕΝΕΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΣΕΝ in short, stubby letters is placed on this side extending from in front of the youth under the right eye. Added red is used to indicate the fillet and a stripe on the garment. *B*. Similar to *A*, but the youth is wearing a long striped himation which he holds at his chest with his right hand. The left hand holds the eyebrow of the right eye. Added white is used for the clusters of dots on the glaze stripes of the himation and the lower border. All other details are incised. The eyes are the conventional 'male' eyes with a dot of added red covering the point of the incising compass. In addition to the black center, the irises have bands of red, white and glaze between incised circles. The rest of the eye is reserved with a glaze exterior rim and thick brows. The right eye of side *A* is raised slightly to allow the last part of the signature to fit under it.

On the mid-band (between the ridges) is a simple meander pattern (fig. 9). The main part of the body is glazed. Below this is a band with a bud pattern linked with overlapping semi-circles and dots between buds, and below this a ray pattern. The body is separated from the foot by a ridge painted with added red and an incised line on either side. The lower, flatter part of the foot is separated from the more conical upper section by a similar ridge. The entire exterior of the foot is glazed as a single wide band on the interior raised portion of the underside of the foot.

Sir John Beazley attributed all of the signed Nikosthenic amphorai, including this one, to a Painter N of Nikosthenes.⁵ Furthermore, he divided these vases into

1) J. D. Beazley, "Mid-Sixth Century Black-Figure" *BSA* 32 (1932/3) 22; *Development of Attic Black-Figure* (1951) 72; S. Karouzou, *BCH* 79 (1955) 197; E. T. Vermeule, *Antike Kunst* 12 (1969) 9-15. For the Painter N in particular, Gallatin, "The Origin of the Form of the 'Nikosthenic' Amphora" *AJA* 30 (1926) 78, R.M. Cook, *Greek Painted Pottery* (1960) 223 and Beazley, *Paralipomena*, 106 (hereafter, *Para.*). 2) S. B. Luce, "Nikosthenes: His Activity and Affiliation" *AJA* 29 (1925) 42-3; 45 and fig. 3 (two bucchero amphorai in Philadelphia); Gallatin, *AJA* 30 (1926) 76-8 with earlier bibliography. For a discussion of these vases as prototypes see Mingazzini, *Vasi della Collezione Castellani* (1930) 38-39 with reference to nos. 119, 124, 125 and 129 on pl. III. See also CVA France fasc. 24 (Musée Dubouche) pl. 17 nos. 79-98. In general, Cook, *Greek Painted Pottery*, 223 and John Boardman, *Athenian Black-Figured Vases* (1974) 64 (hereafter, Boardman).

3) In addition to the present vase, I am aware of the following: 1) Kansas City 52.220 (*ABV* 219, no. 23); 2) Cleveland, 74.10 (*ABV* 219, no. 24) ex private collection, see Arias, Hirmer and Shefton, *A History of Greek Vase Painting* (1962) pl. XIII (hereafter Arias, Hirmer, Shefton); 3) Providence 23.303 (*ABV* 220, no. 34); 4) Baltimore Archaeological Society (*ABV* 220, no. 36), 5) Kansas City 42.50 fr. (*ABV* 222, no. 54) and 6) University of Chicago 268 (*ABV* 222, no. 55).

4) I am indebted to Dr. Jiří Frel, Curator of Antiquities of the J. Paul Getty Museum for asking me to publish this vase and for his hospitality and assistance while I was in Malibu. In addition, I am most grateful to the American Philosophical Society of Philadelphia for assistance in this project with a grant from the Penrose Fund.

5) *Para.* 106, ex. Sotheby. For the Painter N see *ABV* 216-226, 690; *Para.* 106-109; E. Paribeni, "Nikosthenes, Pittore" *EEA*, v, 486-7 with

various categories according to the decorative patterns used. While the Getty Museum vase belongs with the others attributed to Painter N, it is worth noting that it does not fall into the normal decorative patterns used for Nikosthenic amphorai. A review of Beazley's pattern groups will show the contrast.

The first group (*a*), the Overlap Group, nos. 1-7, is characterized by large figures painted over the shoulder and the ridges that mark the shoulder from the body of the vase. These vases show little attempt to adapt the decoration to the shape of the vase and may have been the earliest of the types.⁶ Figured scenes on the mid-band characterize the Torlonia Group (*β*) and related vases (*γ*), nos. 8-15. The use of animal friezes on these vases dates them to the middle of the century rather than later, making them contemporary with, or slightly later than the Overlap Group.

The satyrs and maenads below the mid-band of the Thiasos Group (*δ*), nos. 16-26, probably to be dated ca. 535-520, show a close correspondence with Chalcidian amphorai⁷ and early examples of the kyathos.⁸ Rather elaborate floral patterns of various types mark the Double-Floral Group (*ε*), nos. 27-31, related vases (*ζ*), nos. 32-33 and The Group of Louvre F100 (*η*) which has figured scenes on the handles and shoulders in addition to the floral decoration. These groups are most difficult to date but may be contemporary with the Thiasos Group. All of these vases and the Nikosthenic amphorai in other groups, with a few exceptions to be noted below, are characterized by extensive decoration which covers most of the vase in a manner which tends to obscure the lines of the form and to detract from consideration of any single decorative element.

In many respects these vases deserve the scorn which has been heaped upon them. This is due not to any lack of skill in any particular element of the decoration but to the rather garish combination of decorative motifs which continue to strike the eye as un-Hellenic and over-

done. The Getty Museum vase belongs with a select number of Nikosthenic amphorai, which although signed by Nikosthenes with the usual signature,⁹ stand apart from the rest of the production. The amphora in the Louvre, F114, in Six's technique,¹⁰ has only a figure of a nude woman on each side of the neck and a tripod on each handle. The rest of the vase is covered in a solid black glaze and the signature has been made with added red. Certainly one of the earliest vases in Six's technique, the minimal decoration on this unique vase may be due to the experimental nature of the technique. Since, however, it is generally accepted that Six's technique was an attempt to compete with red-figure when it began, this vase should be placed no earlier than 530 and probably closer to 520. A second example of special amphora decoration is the black-figure amphora in the Kestner-Museum in Hanover (1971.23).¹² Described by Beazley as unique, it has dolphins around the mouth, a tripod on one handle and an elaborate pattern on the other. The neck has a large male eye on each side. The shoulder has a small reserve section on side A with a reclining nude youth holding a drinking horn while B has only two small reserve patches, one at the side of each handle, with a palmette inside the reserve area. The rest of the vase, with the exception of rays at the bottom, is glazed. Follman, in the *CVA*, is surely right when she places this as a late work of Painter N. These two vases, then, share with the Getty Museum vase the more sparing use of decoration, the use of tripods and the signature of Nikosthenes.

The use of these elements is not confined to the vases noted above. Dolphins of a similar nature are to be found on eight other vases¹³ including the Hanover vase. Of these, four have tripods on their handles,¹⁴ but only one of these, Vatican 362, with a scene of boxers on the shoulder, shows any similarity to the Getty Museum vase. The Getty Museum vase, however, is different from all of the other dolphin vases in that it has more dolphins

bibliography; Boardman, 65.

6) Compare this with the earliest kyathoi painted by Painter N (*ABV* 223, nos. 60-64), Eisman, *Attic Kyathos Painters* (diss. 1971, available through University Microfilms, Ann Arbor) 54-76 (hereafter *AKP*). The earliest two examples (Bryn Mawr, P88; *ABV* 223, no. 62; *AKP* no. 1, pp. 59-62; Hoppin, *BF*, no. 10 and *AJA* 20 (1916) 315-16 and Boston, Museum of Fine Arts 03.853; *ABV* 223, no. 61; *AKP* no. 2, pp. 62-4; Hoppin, *BF* no. 8) show a similar disregard for the shape of the vase compared to later examples by Painter N and other painters of the Nikosthenic workshop (Eisman, *Archaeology*, 28 [1975] 76-83 and photographs pp. 78f.)

7) Brussels A135; *CVA* Brussels fasc. 2, III E, pl. 1 no. 1.

8) *AKP* nos. 4-6, pp. 56-7; *ABV* 223, nos. 63 and 64 and *ARV*² 54, no. 8 (B, 11). On the scene: Arias, Hirmer and Shefton, p. 294.

9) Eisman, "A Further Note on ΕΠΟΙΕΣΕΝ Signatures" *JHS* 94 (1974) p. 172.

10) Louvre F114, *ABV* 226. For Nikosthenic production of Six's technique see J. Six, "Vases Polychromes sur fond noir de la période archaïque" *Gazette archéologique* 13 (1888) 193-201; C.H.E. Hasples *ABL* 106 and "A Lekythos in Six's Technique" *MUSE* 3 (1969) 24-28. Compare this vase with the kyathos in the British Museum, B693 (*ABV* 609, no. 1; Walters, II, pl. 7, no. 1; *AKP* no. 13, pp. 96-9 and *Archaeology* 28 (1975) 76-83.

11) In addition to the notes above, see Boardman, 178-179.

12) Hanover 1961.23; *Para.* 106, no. 58 bis; *CVA* pl. 17, nos. 1-5.

13) 1) Louvre F102 (*ABV* 216, no. 4; 2) Paris, Darthès (*ABV* 217, no. 10); 3) Brussels R388 with additions (*ABV* 217, no. 11); 4) Vatican 362 (*ABV* 218, no. 12 and *Para.* 104); 5) Castle Ashby, *ABV* 221, no. 40); 6) Castle Ashby (*ABV* 221, no. 44), for the dolphins see Hoppin, *BF*, p. 194, which were omitted from Beazley's description; 7) Last known on the Roman market (*ABV* 225, no. 10 and 8) Hanover 1961.23.

14) Note 13, nos. 1 (Louvre F102), 4 (Vatican 362), 7 (Roman market)

and is the only one with dolphins arranged in descending size.

Tripods on the handles are to be found on seven other vases including Louvre F114 (Six's technique) and on one handle of Hanover 1961.²³ Of the others, Vatican 362 and two others already mentioned have dolphins.¹⁵ Of the vases with tripods on the handle without dolphins other than Louvre F114,¹⁶ neither are close in feeling to the Getty Museum vase.

Boxers, both between a tripod and with a tripod, are common scenes.¹⁷ They appear on a number of vases from the Nikosthenic workshop as well as on specific Nikosthenic amphorai.¹⁸ Again, where close parallels for the placement of the boxers on the neck occur, the rest of the vase is crowded with other decorative aspects which give it a totally different look.

The large eyes, which are a standard feature of Attic vase painting between 530 and 510 on a variety of shapes,¹⁹ appear on seven other Nikosthenic amphorai. Of these, three have dolphins, and only one has boxers between a tripod.²¹ Parallels to the decoration of the Getty Museum vase are to be found only on Brussels R388 where the shoulder has a running satyr holding the brows of the large eyes. The iris of the eye is reserved. The use of white for the iris is found on many kylixes and large shapes while the reserve iris is found predominantly on the smaller shapes such as the kotyle, mastoid and kyathos. Both are found on kylixes and give some indication of chronology. While there is some overlap between all forms of the eye, eyes with white irises are earlier than those with reserve irises and these are earlier than those with glaze irises.²² In absolute terms it means that on the basis of the eye alone, the Getty Museum vase should date between 520 and 510.

and 8 (Hanover 1961.23).

15) Note 13, nos. 2 (Darthès) and 7 (Roman market).

16) Louvre F106 (ABV 218, no. 13) and Villa Giulia 20863 (ABV 218, no. 14; note the correction of the number in *Para.* 104).

17) For a selected list see T.B.L. Webster, *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens* (1972) 203-205.

18) Non-Nikosthenic amphorai from the workshop include: Tarquinia RC 1076 (ABV 223, no. 59; *Para.* 104) and London B295 (ABV 226, no. 1; *Para.* 106). Other Nikosthenic amphorai with boxers on the neck: 1) Rome, Torlonia 1879.32 (ABV 217, no. 8; *Para.* 104); 2) Baltimore Archaeological Society (ABV 220, no. 36); 3) Goettingen J.16 (ABV 222, no. 48); Malmaison 299 (ABV 225, no. 9; *Para.* 105); 5) Aachen (*Para.* 105, no. 43 bis.); with boxers on the shoulder; 6) Vatican 362; 7) Cambridge 3.1962 (*Para.* 105, no. 7 bis.); 8) Vatican 364 (ABV 219, no. 20); and 9) Kansas City 52.220 (ABV 219, no. 23; *Para.* 104). In addition, note Hoppin, *BF*, nos. 73* and 84* which I am unable to locate. For a discussion of the boxer motif as it relates to this vase see the forthcoming article by Brian Legakis.

19) F. Villard, "L'évolution des coupes attiques à figures noires" *REG* 48 (1946) 173-77.

20) Castle Ashby (ABV 221, no. 40), Brussels R388 and Hanover 1961.23.

The schema of the large eyes with a scene of one, two or three figures between them is common for small forms during this period, but unusual on larger forms.²³ Its use on the Getty Museum vase is matched only by a few other Nikosthenic amphorai. Vatican 363 uses white eyes to frame a scene of a warrior standing next to his horse and being greeted by his dog. The neck has an elaborate palmette and lotus pattern while the lower part of the vase is filled with bands of floral ornamentation. Brussels R388, noted above, gives the same equally busy appearance with bands of figures both above and below the shoulder.²⁴ The Aachen vase has a dancing satyr and maenad on each side between eyes with a reserve iris. The rest of the vase is filled with elaborate decorative patterns. Goettingen J16 recalls other products of the Nikosthenic workshop in its schema. It has a seated youth between two others flanked by sphinxes. One of the common patterns of kyathos decoration is to place a central scene between eyes and then flank the eyes with matched figures such as sphinxes, lions, satyrs, etc.,²⁵ a schema found also on kylixes of the workshop.²⁶ Here the eyes have been omitted but the rest of the schema has been retained. In addition, this is the only Nikosthenic amphora with youths in this arrangement.²⁷ Finally, the Hanover vase has youths reclining but not flanked by eyes.

The Nikosthenic amphorai attributed to Painter N strike one as having a wide variety of decorative schema, notwithstanding the relative uniformity of style seen in the individual figured elements. The Painter N does not seem to have limited himself to any one particular design. The relative chronology of the schemas, such as it is, does suggest that the earlier vases (primarily the Overlap Group) developed into a more ornate and de-

21) Aachen (*Para.* 105, no. 43 bis.). The other Nikosthenic amphorai with eyes: 1) Paris, Petit Palais 303 (ABV 221, no. 38); 2) Vatican 363 (ABV 221, no. 43; and 3) last known on the Roman market (ABV 225, no. 12).

22) Villard, *REG* 48 (1946) 177.

23) The name piece of the Eye-Siren Group, London B215 (ABV 286, no. 1) is an unusual example. For a few others Munich 1480 (ABV 288, no. 11); London B315 (CVA IIIH, pl. 192). The krater rim, Louvre Cp. 11291 (CVA IIIH pl. 192) shows an expanded form of this type of schema.

24) It should be noted that Brussels R388 does not have the usual signature of Nikosthenes but rather the signature is made with short stubby letters. See *JHS* 94 (1974) p. 172.

25) *AKP* 38. Note the production of The Group of Vatican G57 (ABV 610-614) and other contemporary kyathos groups.

26) For example, most kylixes of the Leafless Group (ABV 632-648). For the identification of the Caylus Painter, the leading painter in the Leafless Group, as part of the Nikosthenic workshop, see *AJA* 74 (1970) 193 and *AKP* 525-530.

27) Compare the kyathos in the Hermitage B 103, attributed to the Group of Vatican G57 by K. S. Gorbunova (Eisman, "New Attributions of Attic Kyathoi" *AJA* 77 [1973] 77, no. 5).

1-9 Nikosthenic amphora. J. Paul Getty Museum 68.AE.19

1



2




4



3

0 5 cm.
J. Paul Getty Museum 68AE19

W. E. H.



5



tailed schema. The Painter N must have been an experimenter trying first one type and then another.²⁸ His virtuosity, however, is suspicious. Are we really concerned with the total production of one painter? Beazley believed this to be the case although he singled out some vases as less certain than others.²⁹ I think that what has been called the Painter N might better be labeled "the Group of Nikosthenes". Several of the Nikosthenic amphorai seem to be more easily detachable from the rest of the attributed sample:

Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg inv. no. 13809 (*Para.* 105, no. 4bis)—A Thiasos scene quite different from the usual "Painter N". London B 296 (*ABV* 218, no. 18)—Note the different signature and the spelling ΝΙΚΟΣΘΕΝΕΕΣ ΕΠΟΙΕΣΕΝ. The cocks are much more simplified and the sirens resemble those of the Group of Vatican G57 (kyathoi from the Nikosthenic workshop). London B 297 (*ABV* 218, no. 16)—There are a number of differences in standard type figures here. The satyrs seem to be by another hand; the proportions of the figures are different; the youth and the sphinx are considerably thinner than normal. Malmaison 298 (*Para.* 105, no. 34 bis)—An early example but considerably better painting, particularly on the shoulder, than we expect. Petit Palais 302 (*ABV* 29, no. 22)—Much more crowded than usual. This one may still really belong with the bulk of the production. Petit Palais 303 (*ABV* 221, no. 38)—Another dubious choice. There has been a large amount of repainting and that may account for the unusual satyrs and maenads. Vatican 361 (*ABV* 216, no. 1)—the detail work and incision is excellent. The painter shows influence from Exekias. Vatican 362 (*ABV* 218, no. 12)—The general style of the figures is rather different. This is a very open composition.

Vatican 362 is the closest to the Getty Museum vase in the number of elements shared. The Vatican vase is more ornate and has an extra band of animals near the bottom of the body. Even so it would seem that the two vases are

by the same hand and that the Getty Museum vase is slightly later in date. The late vases, including the Getty Museum vase, Louvre F114 and the Hanover vase, are notable for the openness of composition and the similarity with other contemporary Attic vases, particularly in the types of large eyes and the form of the palmette design used. The later variations of the Nikosthenic amphora totally abandon the non-Hellenic aspects of decoration and follow the normal contemporary conventions for neck amphorai.³⁰ The Getty Museum amphora should be placed after Vatican 362 and before the Class of Cabinet des Médailles 281 and other related shapes. Thus a date of about 515 B.C. seems most justified.

This places our vase in the period of the tyranny in Athens. Hippias, the son of Peisistratos, continued the expansionist and urbanization policies of Solon and his father. The period was a prosperous one for the merchant and craftsman whose share of foreign markets had increased rapidly in a generation and a half. Athenian pottery by the second half of the century dominated the fine ware market to the virtual exclusion of all other competitors. It is in this market condition that we encounter Nikosthenes. In addition to the normal production of Attic vases he produced the Nikosthenic amphora and the kyathos, specialized products designed for the Etruscan market.

The workshop must have eventually become one of the largest in Athens. Although total numbers are hard to obtain, given the number of painters working in the shop over its duration, a conservative estimate would call for thirty workers in the shop at any one time. The list of known painters and painter groups who worked with Nikosthenes is quite extensive. At one time or another Lydos,³¹ Anakles,³² Psiax,³³ the Theseus Painter,³⁴ the Caylus Painter,³⁵ and Oltos,³⁶ were working in the shop. In addition to these, numerous other painters (now generally collected into Groups which may represent one

28) Compare the kyathoi signed by Nikosthenes (*ABV* 223, nos. 60-64) where no less than three different types of decorative schema are used, of which none have any continuation in the succeeding kyathoi (*AKP* 56-57, 59-76).

29) *ABV* 216 and 224. It should be noted that Beazley's list of vases of which he was less certain (pp. 224ff.) was due to poor information on the vases.

30) Good examples and discussion in Michael L. Katzev, "An Attic Amphora of the Late Sixth Century B.C." *Allen Memorial Art Museum Bulletin* (Oberlin College) 29 (1971) 60-69. Further see *ABV* 319-320: Painter of Boston 01.17 who paints with others, including Oltos, vases of the Class of Cabinet des Médailles 218.

31) *ABV* 109, no. 28, 111, no. 44 and 113, no. 80; see further *ABV* 229 and *Para.* 108. Although Lydos did not paint any of the Nikosthenic amphorai known to us, a number of them have animal friezes which recall Lydos' Corinthian heritage.

32) *ABV* 159; 230, x, no. 1 and *Para.* 108.

33) The connection is established through the kyathoi. My *AJA* 74 (1970) 193 and *AKP* 125-138 as well as *ABV* 293-4, nos. 15 and 16. I do not believe that Psiax spent any considerable time in the workshop; however, his influences are easily detectable in other kyathos painters. See *ABV* 295, 608-10 (near Psiax, Group of Munich 1938 and Group of Berlin 2095); further *AJA* 77 (1973) 71-72.

34) *AJA* 71 (1971) 200. For details on the Theseus Painter see *ABL* 141-148; *ABV* 518-520, 703-704; *AJA* 77 (1973) 72.

35) *AJA* 77 (1973) 73 and *AKP* 525-530.

36) The association of Oltos with the Nikosthenic workshop is not without controversy. Three vases are pertinent to the discussion: a kyathos fragment and two Nikosthenic amphorai of the Class of Cabinet des Médailles 281 in red-figure. The kyathos fragment was originally attributed to the primitive school of Epiktetos and Pheidippos (D. Levi, *CVA Florence fasc. 1*, pl. 2, no. 11). Beazley rejected this

or more painters such as has been noted for Painter N) confined their work to the one shop.³⁷ Among these may have been Nikosthenes himself. We are aware that not always did a single painter work on a vase, but rather young apprentices might be detailed to paint the subsidiary decoration while the main scene would be done by a major painter.³⁸

In addition to the painters one must project numbers for workers to fulfill the other tasks of the pottery operation. There were potters, clay handlers to prepare the clay, and people to work the kiln. The latter operation was of particular importance and required very specialized direction in addition to the physical work of building, stacking and fueling. Finally there must have been some people involved with the business part of the venture—selling, bookkeeping, purchase of materials and general management. No doubt, some of these functions could be combined and in a small shop most probably were.

The Nikosthenic workshop, as one of the larger shops, would tend to operate in the opposite direction. As the shop grew it would be logical to place the kiln operations under the direction of one who best knew how to stack and fire the kiln during the complicated three step process of oxidizing, reduction and re-oxidizing that took place in the single firing. In a similar manner, someone would have to direct both the workers who processed the

clay and the potters. Painters would tend to group themselves around a “master-painter” and the presence of such names as Lydos, Psiax and Oltos in the workshop would tend to confirm that “master-painters” might move from one workshop to another.³⁹ Most important of all, the owner of the shop would have to give it direction and conduct the monetary side of the business.

It is in this capacity that Nikosthenes’ personality seems the most forceful and gives a unity to the various aspects of the workshop. Most of all Nikosthenes can be noted for his innovative ideas in the techniques of painting and shape development. The invention of Six’s technique has been plausibly attributed to his workshop⁴⁰ as has the idea of the white-ground slip for black-figure.⁴¹ Both of these innovations were designed to keep abreast of the competition when the new red-figure technique came into prominence. It has also been suggested, although with considerably less plausibility, that the Nikosthenic workshop was the originator of red-figure. Most scholars, rightly I believe, reject this view and attribute this to the Andokides Painter.⁴² Nikosthenes, however, was quick to have painters in his shop take up the new technique. (Was Psiax brought into the shop as a red-figure specialist?) In all of these technical changes there is no direct link to Painter N (Group of Nikosthenes) and it is probable that Nikosthenes was not the inventor but rather the promoter. He provides within his work-

attribution and placed it with the work of Oltos (*Campana Fragments in Florence* [1933] 9; *ARV*² 54, no. 8) and was supported in this by A. Bruhn (*Oltos and Early Red-Figure Vase Painting* [1943] 26). Even if this attribution, which I think is correct, is rejected, there is evidence that Epiktetos worked in the Nikosthenic shop from three kylixes of which two are signed by Pamphaios (Louvre G5, *ARV*² 71, no. 14; Oberlin, *Para.* 329, no. 14 bis; and Berlin 2262, *ARV*² 72 and 1623, no. 15). The two amphorai (Louvre G2 and G3; *ABV* 320, nos. 13 and 14; *ARV*² 53, nos. 1 and 2; *Para.* 140, no. 4 and 326) have been attributed by Beazley to Oltos and signed by Pamphaios. Bruhn, however, attempted to detach them and the stamnos, London E437 (*ARV*² 54, no. 5 and 1622) as the work of a follower. While rejecting this alternative attribution (cf. Arias, Hirmer and Shefton, 321), it would still point to the association of Oltos with the workshop since Oltos would have trained this painter. (The schema is a cross between the typical Oltos schema and those used for the regular Nikosthenic amphorai.) There are further connections with other red-figure painters who, like Oltos, seem to be connected more with Pamphaios than Nikosthenes.

37) I point out as examples: The BMN Painter (*ABV* 227-228; 690: *Para.* 106-107); the Painter of Louvre F117 (*ABV* 230, 690), and many kyathos painters in the Groups of Munich 1938, Berlin 2091, 2095, Vatican G57 and more. See *AKP* and *AJA* 77 (1973) 71-73 for details. 38) This is clearly shown on a vase in the Torno Museum, Milan (*ARV*² 571 and 1659, no. 73 and *Para.* 390; Noble, *The Techniques of Painted Attic Pottery* [1965] figs. 74 and 207 whence Noble in *The Muses at Work*, ed. Roebuck [1969] 141, fig. 20). On the shoulder of this hydria are depicted three youths painting decorative bands on kraters while leaving the pictorial area clear.

39) For the case of the Theseus Painter see *ABL* 141-148 and *AJA* 75

(1971) 200, where his career is traced through three separate phases in three different workshops.

40) Six, *Gazette archéologique* 13 (1888) 193-210; *ABL* 66 and *MUSE* 3 (1969) 24-25 where Miss Haspels makes the connection to Nikosthenes particularly, but not exclusively, through Louvre F114. *ABL* 106 provides links to kyathoi and the Theseus Painter. London 1900 6-11.1 (*ARV*² 8, no. 13) is an alabastron in Six’s technique by Psiax, workshop undetermined.

41) G. Löschcke, “Dreifussvase aus Tanagra” *Archäologische Zeitung* 39 (1881) 36-37 and Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l’Art, X, La Grèce archaïque, La céramique d’Athènes* (1914) 262. More frequently the earliest white-ground vases are associated with Psiax (Beazley, *Development of Attic Black-Figure* [1951] 78; Arias, Hirmer, Shefton, 304 and Boardman, 106). Psiax has already been connected with the Nikosthenic workshop and the best examples for Psiax’s white-ground are his kyathoi (*ABV* 293-294, nos. 15 and 16; *AJA* 77 [1973] 71). For the connection, *AKP* 133. It is interesting to note that the other two early users of this technique are Paseas, a close associate of Psiax, and the Andokides Painter (see below, n. 42).

42) The suggestion was from S.B. Luce (“Two Kylikes in Providence” *AJA* 32 [1928] 438). Richter notes that “the foremost artists of the beginning of red-figure were the Andokides Painter and Psiax.” *Attic Red-Figure Vases, A Survey* (1958) 46. The relationship between these two painters is intriguing. Could Nikosthenes have sent Psiax to Andokides to learn (for a price) the new technique? If so, did the Andokides Painter return the compliment by using the white-ground technique (favored by Psiax) on the black side of his bilingual amphorai, Louvre F203 (*ABV* 253, No. 3 and *ARV*² 4, no. 13) and New York 63.11.6 (*ARV*² 1617, no. 2 bis ex Geneva market [Koutoulakis]), or did Nikosthenes lure Psiax away from Andokides?



8



9



shop the opportunity for this development and encourages its use. Considering the restriction on both Six's technique and the use of the white-ground slip, one might suggest that Nikosthenes also tried to protect this knowledge and was not readily willing to see other shops take up the ideas. Nikosthenes seems to have been ever ready to pick up a new idea that might help sell his products.⁴³

Beyond this, Nikosthenes seized the concept of producing specialized products for foreign markets. Thus Nikosthenic amphorai which have known proveniences all come from Caere. It was once suggested that "Caeretan amphora" would have been a more appropriate term for them.⁴⁴ It is worth pausing to note that as well known as the shape is, there are actually very few of these vases in comparison to shapes such as the neck amphora, hydria, kylixes and many others. The production of all vases of the Nikosthenic type amphora including the later modifications are really very few. The same is demonstrable for the kyathos.

The kyathos was produced over a forty to fifty year period and was sent to various places in Etruria. Quantities are known from Caere, Vulci, Orvieto and Tarquinia. The total extant sample known is about 400 or an average of about 10 a year during the duration of the production. (This last figure is not a realistic one because we have only a few examples from 535-520; a sharp increase from 520-510; a further increase from 510-500 and then a sharp falling off in the last years.) Estimates vary as to the amount of the total production based on the extant finds. One recent figure is 1%⁴⁵ which would mean a total production of 40,000. Considering that kyathoi were probably used in sets, this means that 500 sets on an average were made and sold per year. This estimate, however, is likely to be quite high,⁴⁶ and a more realistic figure would be about 10% leaving only an average of 100, or 50 sets a year produced. This could hardly be more than one or two cases. Even if we double this figure for the peak years, we are still left with a slow but steady demand. If our sample of known vases is of any help, there was probably one case a year for a while and then

from 520-555 probably two or three cases a year.

Turning to the Nikosthenic amphorai, there are a few more than 100 examples known.⁴⁷ Taking the 1% figure from above, that means a total production of 10,000 amphorai. If the 10% figure is used, then there were only 1,000. This is spread over a period of about thirty to forty years (540-510 or 500)⁴⁸ with no real indication of distribution of production within these years. The numbers are very small and even if the 1% figure is used there could not have been more than several hundred vases made in any given year. Since Caere is the only provenience known for the Nikosthenic amphora, it seems as if the entire production was destined for that city. It is an indication that the market for the product was probably a local fad. Production was probably scheduled accordingly. As the product "caught on" there was a sharp increase in production which then leveled off and finally died out.

In the case of both the amphora and the kyathos we can note a specialization of interest in the Italian market which is not documented elsewhere for the last part of the sixth century. We may note that both shapes give evidence of "product research". Nikosthenes in some manner knew about the specialized shapes that were desired and had some models for either himself or his potters to copy. It is significant that the known examples of bucchero amphorai are either plain or have heavy relief decoration. While the shape is copied (or rather, "improved") from the Etruscan design, the decoration follows patterns that were formulated within the shop. The same holds true of the kyathos.⁴⁹ Therefore, it is a reasonable assumption that the market wanted Etruscan shapes with Attic painting.

This deduction seems fairly simple but has wider implications. The standard picture of Greek overseas commerce creates a system whereby the shipowner stocks his vessel (or has his agent do it) and then sails off to try to sell it and pick up another cargo.⁵⁰ Thus, a merchant strolling through the Kerameikos past Nikosthenes' shop is supposed to take a fancy to the Nikosthenic amphorai displayed (*pace* Beazley), buy them and then sail off to

43) Another such innovation was the use of plastic heads which was obviously borrowed from Etruria. See L. Donati, "Buccheri deonti con teste plastiche umane (Zona di Vulci)" *Studi Etruschi* 35 (1967) 619-32. For Nikosthenic heads, note *ABL* 105; for kyathoi see J. Frel, "Choix de vases attiques en Tchécoslovaquie" *Acta Musei Nationalis Pragae (Sbórník)* 13 (1959) 235-236 and *AKP* 153-154 and 240. Heads are prominent on the oinochoe of the Painter of Louvre F117 (*ABV* 230) and Painter of Louvre F118 (*ABV* 440). This last group may also be part of the Nikosthenic workshop since its vases are painted on a white-ground slip. The similar vase in Naples (Stg. 235; *ABV* 440, no. 1) is noted by Beazley as "near Painter N".

44) Luce, *AJA* 29 (1925) 41-52.

45) T.B.L. Webster, *Potter and Patron in Classical Athens* (1972) 4.

46) Eisman, *AJA* 77 (1973) 448.

47) This includes the total number in Hoppin, *B.F.*, *ABV* and *Para.* under Nikosthenes and the Class of Cabinet des Médailles which also includes those in *ARV*². There are also several new vases.

48) I have used what is probably the widest possible range of dates. Most examples have been dated between 530 and 515.

49) The earliest kyathoi are quite close to the Etruscan bucchero examples and the Etruscan metallic examples. Very quickly the shape developed its caliciform shape (*AKP* 12-13, 18-31).

50) A. French, *The Growth of the Athenian Economy* (1964) 43-44 and 50.

try to sell them. For the Nikosthenic amphora, at least, this cannot be so. All of the products were made for Caere and not many were made. All of the kyathoi were made for Etruria and, again, not many were made. These products, it would seem, were made "to order". It would have been a risky business venture to make products which had no market in Athens on the *chance* that a merchant might buy the small quantity and sell it in the proper market. A much more reasonable hypothesis is that at the time Nikosthenes brought the strange shaped "foreign" vase into his shop he already had a sale. Indeed, if one is allowed to speculate a bit further, he probably demanded payment in full, if not a substantial advance. After the first year there was probably a set agreement for a certain amount of the special vases to be picked up at specific times.

Product research and business caution together would mean that this Nikosthenic production was a carefully arranged operation involving at least three parties: 1) the manufacturer (Nikosthenes), 2) the transporter (not Nikosthenes, but probably a Greek merchant—but not necessarily an Athenian), and 3) a sales outlet in Caere for the amphorai and elsewhere in Etruria for the kyathoi (possibly the Greek merchant but more likely an Etruscan). Finally, there had to be the entrepreneur, the capitalist, who would put the whole network together. It is possible that any of the three might have been involved in this process, but it seems most probable that it was the Greek merchant who had contacts both in Athens and in Etruria who would make these arrangements. As he moved back and forth between Italy and Greece, the transportation of a few Etruscan sample vases to Athens would have been an easy matter. Then, he had to find a pottery workshop capable and desirous of handling this production, if such contacts were not already established. Thus, it seems evident that trade in the specialized foreign products was neither casual nor haphazard.

Given this organization, it is necessary to return to the small amount of production. It seems hardly likely that this type of product would have stimulated the formation of trading links. The volume was too light, and while undoubtedly profitable, it is more probable that this operation would be an extension of an already existing contact and transaction. I would suspect that the normal form of trade for the late sixth century was done by contract and with careful planning of exactly what cargo would be handled at each stage of a voyage and exactly which parties would produce and purchase the goods.

There is some support for this position from other parts of the pottery industry. The lekythoi of the Gela Painter tended to make their way to Sicily rather than

other foreign ports.⁵¹ The port of Spina seems to have been dominated by a group of workshops.⁵² Interestingly, these are not the same firms which were selling pottery on the southern coast of France.⁵³ The detailed process of linking distribution and workshops has only begun at the present time. It is for this reason that the products of the Nikosthenic workshop play such an important role. Because Nikosthenes was an unusual businessman with a flair for the exotic, we can easily identify the product, the producer and the market. Certainly, however, the small production of these specialized products followed the same patterns of contracts and distribution as the bulk of the trade of normal products which were sold throughout the Mediterranean.

Michael M. Eisman
Temple University

51) *ABL* 78; Boardman, 114.

52) This has not been worked out in detail yet, but note the comment of S. Pattitucci, *CVA* Ferrara, fasc. 2 (introduzione) and the vases presented in that fascicule.

53) Indication of this in J.J. Jully, *La céramique de La Monédière, Bessan, Hérault*, Collection Latomus 124, (1973) 261-281.

A Hermes by Kalamis and Some Other Sculptures

In 1972 the J. Paul Getty Museum acquired on the art market a marble head which appears at first glance to be a new replica of the so-called Myronian Perseus (Figs. 1-2).¹ It is carved of an excellent grade of grayish, homogeneous marble, with medium to large crystals, which does not seem to be Parian.² The head is 26 cm. high. Its right eyebrow, central right portion of the mouth, and right side of the chin have been broken away. Both wings on the hat have been lost and there are some minor chips here and there.

As the neck is completely lost, only the marked asymmetry of the face, with displaced axis, indicates the orientation of the head: it is turned towards the left and inclined downward. This is confirmed by the similar pose of a replica, preserved as a bust, in the British Museum. The carving of the Getty piece is powerful and correct, if somewhat academic. Drill work can be detected in the curls, corners of the eyes, nostrils, corners of the mouth, and ear cavities. The face has a high polish, in contrast with the rougher surface of the hair. The rather cold appearance and the academic style of the replica agree well with the early classical features of the original as evident in the additive character of the face, the heavy chin, a marked bone structure and an impression of inarticulate power rather than grace.

The new head compares favorably with the other two published replicas of the so-called Perseus:³ one in the Museo Capitolino Nuovo,⁴ the other in the British Museum.⁵ It has been suggested recently that the British Museum copy does not conform to the stylistic pattern of early Classical art, called the Severe Style.⁶ This erroneous position no doubt reflects a judgment based on photographs rather than on examination of the piece itself. In fact, this apparent lack of Severe elements is due solely to the Roman copyist, who altered the typically Severe nature of the original piece by imbuing it with an air of melancholy. Such misinterpretation of early classical sculpture is not uncommon in Roman versions,⁷ though its emotive interpretation is due rather to our modern vision than to any intentional effect of the Roman craftsman. Let us remember that the well-known relief in the Akropolis Museum has been called the

"Melancholic Athena"⁸ even if there is nothing melancholic about her.

A direct comparison of the British Museum and the Capitoline heads based on the casts of the Skulpturenhalle in Basel⁹ confirms that the two are perfectly identical. The apparent discrepancies result from three things. First, the BM piece, preserved in bust form, shows the correct position of the head while the one in Rome is arbitrarily mounted straight. Second, the current photograph of the Rome piece gives a rather expressionistic and misleading effect. Third, the three replicas inevitably display the artistic style prevalent during the period in which they were carved. Certain affinities with the marked features seen in some portraits of Claudius¹⁰ can be traced in the Rome head. The London bust has the more tempered appearance of late Flavian portraiture.¹¹ The Getty replica seems to be late Hadrianic to very early Antonine. It surely dates before the expressionistic head of the Kassel Apollo in the Museo Capitolino,¹² while it compares favorably with the latest portrait types of Hadrian.¹³

The date of the replica explains its somewhat academic appearance. At the same time, however, this is precisely the period when good copies—as is the case here—were closest to the originals.

Because of its winged head the piece has traditionally been called "Perseus", and hence associated with either Pythagoras of Rhegion or Myron; literary tradition credits both with a Perseus.¹⁴ Myron has more partisans,¹⁵ but a comparison of this head with those of the Diskobolos or Athena yields nothing in common beyond the most general trivialities. On closer examination the differences between them and the "Perseus" are striking. Both the Diskobolos and the Athena are perfectly coherent, from the stylistic point of view, in contrast to "Perseus". On the one hand, the latter appears more "classical", and so more "advanced", yet the facial structure, as in the earlier Severe manner, is more additive. On the other hand, the asymmetries and distortions of the face are much more marked in "Perseus" than in the other two. This point is surely linked to the relative positions of head and body.¹⁶ And, after all,

1) 72.AA.154. I mentioned the head in *Art Bulletin*, 56 (1974), p. 27.

2) It may have been carved in Asia Minor and the marble may be of this origin; there is a tradition that it was found in Italy.

3) See G. Lippold, *Griechische Plastik*, p. 139, nos. 12 and 13.

4) Lippold, pl. 50, 2; B. Ridgway, *The Severe Style*, fig. 121; W. Fuchs, *Die Skulptur der Griechen*, p. 557, figs. 666-667.

5) Ridgway, fig. 120.

6) Ridgway, p. 84.

7) Thus, for example, the best replica of the head of Pheidias' Lemnia—the Pallagi head—is the least faithful.

8) See F. Chamoux, *RA* (1948), 1, 136ff., and *RA* (1972), 2, 263ff. For

its ancient restoration, cf. Frel, *AAA*, 5 (1972), pp. 74f., and also *Art Bulletin*, 56 (1974), p. 272.

9) *Skulpturenhalle Basel* (ed. 1972), p. 36, nos. 540, 541.

10) Cf. V. M. Poulsen, *Les portraits romains* (Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg), pls. 93-97.

11) Cr. M. Wegner, *Die Flavii*, pl. 16c.

12) See *Antike Plastik*, VI, pls. 42-44.

13) Cf. M. Wegner, *Hadrian*, pl. 27.

14) Oberbeck, *Schriftquellen*, 500; 541.

15) Lippold, *Griechische Plastik*, 139; C. Picard, *Manuel*, ii, 298.

16) Cf. L. Schneider, *Asymmetrie griechischer Köpfe* (1973), *passim*.



1, 2 Head of Hermes. J. Paul Getty Museum 72.AA.154



why must this be a Perseus rather than a Hermes?

Recently, by a simple comparison of the photographs, W. Fuchs convincingly demonstrated a close stylistic affinity between the so-called Perseus and the Kassel Apollo.¹⁷ This relationship is even more emphatically evident in the Getty piece. The soundness of Fuchs' opinion is borne out by the obvious kinship between our specimen and several copies of the Kassel Apollo. The Kassel Apollo likewise presents a curiously striking combination of advanced and retardatory elements. Since it is generally accepted as Pheidias' Parnopios, Fuchs makes the same attribution for the "Perseus". But to include the "Perseus" in the general oeuvre of Pheidias seems to be the most uncongenial solution and is made even less likely by consideration of the Getty head.

E. Harrison¹⁸ has persuasively revived the suggestion made years ago by M. Bieber that the original of the Kassel Apollo should be attributed to Kalamis. Following the arguments in this as yet unpublished study, our Hermes (ex-Perseus) might fit rather well into the group of sculptures she establishes for Kalamis.¹⁹

The Kassel Apollo was extensively reproduced in Roman times. Fortunately, all the surviving copies are now collected in one publication.²⁰ Two more heads can be added to the set: one in the Honolulu Academy of Art (Figs. 3-4)²¹ has been mistaken for an Athena and is virtually unpublished²²; the other, in a private collection in Solothurn (Figs. 5-6),²³ has been tentatively identified as an Apollo²⁴ though its relationship to the Kassel statue has not been noted. Both share a characteristic technical detail: the cranium and most of the hair were carved separately and then attached. Both pieces are early Antonine in date and share a completely classicistic approach which tries to suppress most of the Severe Style features. They are more interesting for the history

of Roman copyists, in that they show a well-established trend, than as additional supports for the original.

If the Kassel type is not from the hand of Pheidias, the Tiber Apollo (Fig. 7) must be his, as many scholars have maintained.²⁵ A copy of the statue, formerly in the garden of the Villa Borghese and supposedly lost, can be reproduced in a poor photograph without most of the restoration.²⁶

In concluding, we can mention two more Apollo heads in the J. Paul Getty Museum. The first (Fig. 8)²⁷ has long been held to be an Aphrodite,²⁸ and indeed there is some resemblance to the Capitoline type. C. C. Vermeule brings it close to the Apollo of Timarchides.²⁹ But there is no trace of the right hand resting on the head and the stance, too, is completely different. Comparison of this piece with a badly battered sample of the Timarchides Apollo (Fig. 9), purchased in a sale recently,³⁰ makes this absolutely clear.

It seems that the Belvedere Apollo (Fig. 10) is a much more appropriate candidate even if there may be some difficulties in establishing our head as a direct replica.³¹ There is, however, another, rather surprising trace of the Belvedere Apollo in Southern California. The Los Angeles County Museum of Art possesses a painting by J. H. Fuseli from about 1790³² entitled *Satan, Sin and Death* (Fig. 11), and lo and behold! Satan is none other than the Belvedere Apollo, with only some reversal in the stance. What an end for the god worshipped by Winckelmann and Goethe as the supreme incarnation of the true Hellenic ideal of beauty!

Jiří Frel

J. Paul Getty Museum

17) In Helbig⁴, no. 1771, and *Skulptur der Griechen*, pp. 557f.

18) In a lecture at Columbia University, Fall 1972.

19) Others, according to Harrison, may be the "Sappho" Albani, the "Danae"—"Suppliant" Barberini (Louvre), etc.

20) Eva Maria Schmidt, *Antike Plastik*, VI.

21) I thank Mrs. F. Hart of the Honolulu Academy of Art for the information, photographs and permission to reproduce them.

22) No. 3604. Height 11.5 cm.; probably Italian marble. Purchased from the collection of M. Sevadjian in Paris. *Honolulu Academy of Art* (1937), p. 62.

23) I thank Mr. J. Müller for his kind hospitality and his permission to study the head.

24) 21 cm., probably Pentelic marble; J. Racz-K. Kerenyi, *Antikes Erbe*, fig. 74.

25) Cf. E. Paribeni, *Sculture greche e romane* (Museo delle Terme), pp. 18f., no. 13; while J. Dörig, *JdI*, 80 (1965), pp. 230 ff., supports the attribution to Kalamis.

26) See Dörig, *I.I.* 213, note 401; 233, fig. 77 (with previous restorations); present height 193 cm.

27) 58.AA.2. Height 42 cm.; blue-grayish marble with large crystals, surely from Asia Minor.

28) See the caption in J. Paul Getty, *Joys of Collecting* (New York, 1965), p. 79. (It should be emphasized that Jean Charbonneaux was not responsible for this or for any other caption concerning antiquities accompanying his essay.)

29) C. Vermeule and N. Neuerburg, *Catalogue of the Ancient Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum* (1973), p. 5, no. 6.


30) 73.AA.19. Height 38 cm.; white crystalline marble, surely from Asia Minor. Parke-Bernet sale catalogue, May 4, 1973, no. 198.

31) There may be some difficulties with the replicas of the Apollo Belvedere. Only the one in Basel is perfectly acceptable. The authenticity of the two others is questionable at the very least; see R. Tölle, *JdI*, 81 (1966), p. 168, fig. 20 (Malmö) and p. 170, fig. 21 (London, art market). Let us mention as a curiosity the dating of the Apollo to the classicistic phase of Hellenism; see C. M. Havelock, *Hellenistic Art*, p. 124.

32) Los Angeles County Museum of Art 59.56, gift of Mr. and Mrs. Frederick M. Nicholas, Mr. and Mrs. Harry B. Swerdlow, and Mr. and Mrs. William K. Glikbarg. 67.3 cm by 58.4 cm. I thank K. Donahue for permission to reproduce the photograph.



3, 4 Head of Apollo. Honolulu Academy of Art 3604



5, 6 Head of Apollo. Private collection in Solothurn







7 Tiber Apollo, lost



8 Head of Apollo. J. Paul Getty Museum 58.AA.2.



9 Head of Apollo by Timarchides. J. Paul Getty Museum 73.AA.19



- 10 Apollo Belvedere
- 11 J. H. Fuseli, *Satan, Sin and Death*. Los Angeles County Museum of Art 59.56.



Two Roman Portrait Reliefs

Included among the many superb portrait sculptures recently acquired by the J. Paul Getty Museum are two marble sepulchral reliefs of the type which display portrait busts within a simple rectangular frame.¹ One of them represents a Roman freedman and freedwoman who are identified in a partially effaced inscription on the lower border of the frame (Fig. 6)²:

C·POPILLIUS·O·L· CALPURNIA·O·ET
SALVIVS OCTAVI·L·NICE

The other relief is a fragment of a larger monument which bears no inscription (Fig. 1).³ Its single preserved male portrait is turned very slightly toward the center of the relief indicating that it was once accompanied by one or more busts. Probably the immediately adjacent bust represented his wife, for his right arm is extended in a gesture which can be reconstructed as a *dextrarum iunctio*, often found on these reliefs.⁴

Although both reliefs are of uncertain provenance

and date, they are of the kind commonly produced for freed slaves in Rome and its immediate environs during the late Republican and early Imperial periods.⁵ Until recently, when they were taken to the Museo Nazionale Romano delle Terme, many such reliefs were to be seen along the Via Appia Antica in Rome dislodged from their original positions on the facades of family mausoleums.⁶ The family names recorded in the inscription of the first mentioned Getty relief (Fig. 6) provide further indication of an urban-Roman origin. Both Popillius and Calpurnius are names which appear frequently among the recorded inscriptions from Rome as well as in political notices of the late Republic.⁷ It may be that the freed slaves portrayed on the Getty relief, or their ancestors, once belonged to members of distinguished branches of those families.

The fragmentary relief in the Getty Collection (Fig. 1) is also most probably from the vicinity of Rome. As was noted above, its overall format corresponds to numerous

1) It may be that the format of these reliefs was inspired by the patrician Roman practice of placing wax masks of their ancestors in wooden shrines in the atria of their homes. (See Polybios VI, 53 and Pliny, *N.H.* XXXV, 6-7.) However, Annie N. Zadoks-Josephus Jitta, in *Ancestral Portraiture in Rome and the Art of the Last Century of the Republic* (Allard Pierson Stichting, Universiteit van Amsterdam, Archaeol.-hist. Bijdragen; Amsterdam 1932), 70, proposes that "the very simple form of framing is closely bound up with the architectural application of these stones in sepulchral monuments..." (See *infra*, n. 6). The idea of a deep niche format is anticipated in Hellenistic stelai. The frames of these, however, are usually aedicular. For examples see M. Collignon, *Les statues funéraires dans l'art grec* (Paris 1911), 271-272, 304, fig. 174 and E. Pfuhl, "Das Beiwerk auf den ostgriechischen Grabreliefs," *Jahrbuch des k. deutschen archäologischen Instituts* 20 (1905), 47-96, 123-155. See W. Altmann, *Die römischen Grabaltäre der Kaiserzeit* (Berlin 1905), 197 for additional observations.

2) Purchased in 1971, (71AA260). Marble. H. 63.5 cm, W. 89 cm, D. 20.3 cm. C. Vermeule and N. Neuerburg, *Catalogue of the Ancient Art in the J. Paul Getty Museum* (1973), 37-8, no. 83. The inscription is not recorded in C.I.L. (See *infra*, n. 7). The damage to the inscription appears to have resulted from a deliberate attempt to erase it. Both persons mentioned may well have been deceased at the time the monument was erected. While a *theta nigrum* was sometimes placed next to the names of deceased persons, the practice seems not to have been adhered to consistently. See Ida Calabi Limentani, *Epigrafia Latina* (Biblioteca Storica Universitaria, Trattato III; Milan 1968), 218-219 and references. On the other hand, living persons depicted on reliefs of this kind were frequently distinguished by the addition of VIVIT next to their names or above their busts on the upper border of the frame. See Olof Vessberg, *Studien zur Kunstgeschichte der römischen Republik* (Skrifter Utgivna av Svenska Institutet i Rom, VII; Lund and Leipzig 1941), pls. XXXI, 2 and 3 for examples. (Hereafter cited as Vessberg, *Studien*.) It should also be remembered that the reversed C (↻) indicates a woman as one of the owners.

3) Given to the Museum by Pino Donati in memory of George Getty, (73AA56). Italian marble. H. 57 cm, D. 33 cm. (H. of head, 18 cm.) J. Frel, *Greek and Roman Portraits from the J. Paul Getty Museum*, California State University at Northridge (Oct. 16-Nov. 11, 1973), 19, no. 16.


4) For the history of the gesture: R. Brilliant, *Gesture and Rank in*

Roman Art ("Memoirs of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences," XIV, 1963), 18-21, 34, 35, 42, 44. For examples, see *infra*, n. 21.

5) Vessberg, *Studien*, 175-208, is still the most extensive illustrated compendium of the reliefs. Although not all of the known reliefs are inscribed, the majority of those bearing inscriptions include the name of at least one freedman or freedwoman.

6) Reliefs of this type were embedded in the wall of the mausoleum usually above the entrance way. Arvid Andréén, "Classical Antiquities of the Villa San Michele," *Opuscula Romana* V (1965), 134-145, no. 24; J.M.C. Toynbee, *Death and Burial in the Roman World* ("Aspects of Greek and Roman Life," ed. H. H. Scullard; London 1971), 118, 245; Zadoks-Jitta, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 1). See also the forthcoming study by Diana E. E. Kleiner (diss. Columbia University, New York).

The longitudinal format and rough working of the sides and back of both of the Getty reliefs as well as some cuttings on both of the blocks indicate that they were also of the built-in variety. Had they been free-standing stelai, they probably would have had roughly carved tenons which could have been implanted in the earth for greater stability. Instead, on the relief of Popillius and Calpurnia, there is a smoothly chiselled border, c. 10 cm. wide, on the outer edges of all four sides of the frame. In some places only about 0.5 cm of the border has been finished to a smooth texture. At least this much of the border must have projected from the wall of the tomb, giving emphatic definition to the window-like space in which the busts are encased. Both reliefs also have clamp holes in the top portions of the blocks. Traces of two are preserved in the relief of Popillius and Calpurnia and one in the relief fragment. In the former they are placed 31.5 cm apart, approximately equidistant from the outermost edges of the slab. The better preserved of these two holes measures 4.5 cm square and 5.5 cm in depth. In the relief fragment, the hole is placed next to the outer edge of the block and measures c. 4 cm by 2.5 cm. These cuttings are typical clamp holes which would have served either in attaching the reliefs to the wall or in lifting them into position. See G. Lugli, *La tecnica edilizia romana* (Rome 1957) II, pl. XXXI (sollevamento e collegamento dei blocchi). 7) The indices of C.I.L. VI (Rome) record numerous Calpurnii and Popillii. Among them are three by the name of Calpurnia Nice (4893, 14238, 14239). For magistracies held by various members of these families, see T. Robert S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* II, 99 B.C.-31 B.C. (American Philological Association XV,



1 Fragment of a Funerary Relief, J. Paul Getty Museum
73 AA 56 Museum Photo



2 Head of an Old Man from a Relief, Ostia Museum, Photo Scavi di Ostia



3 Head of an Old Man, formerly in the Staatliche Museen, Berlin, Museum Photo SK 5590

urban-Roman examples, but, more specifically, the style and rendering of its portrait typify the best work of the native Roman artistic tradition. While there has been considerable damage to the nose, eyes, and mouth, the better preserved portions of the face reveal an expertly rendered, vigorous portrait.⁸ Traces of dark red paint on the garment and relief ground hint at a once even more strikingly lifelike appearance. In its structure, the head may be characterized as stereometric. For all its boney appearance, the underlying mass of the head is composed of abstract geometrical solids rather than modeled to resemble an organic, skeletal form. The surface detail is linear with sharp edges and engraved lines predominating in the head as well as the drapery. These qualities of form, which are widely acknowledged as typical of Etruscan and Italic art,⁹ were retained in the indigenous, vernacular tradition of portraiture in Rome. Numerous sculptures of this type attest that workshops of the indigenous tradition continued to flourish well into the early years of the Empire despite the competition and inevitable influence of art and artists from the Hellenistic world.¹⁰

The majority of images produced by artisans who worked within the Roman vernacular tradition convey the impression of a lifelike portrait while also conforming to a recognizable stereotype. Although the various stereotypes have never been studied systematically, it would appear that they were intended to emulate ideals expressed in the portraiture created for members of the Roman aristocracy.¹¹ The Getty portrait of an aging man (Fig. 1) is closely related to a type which is repeated in numerous funerary sculptures of the late Republican and early Imperial era. This type, as illustrated by an

example in Ostia (Fig. 2),¹² another formerly in Berlin (Fig. 3),¹³ and a third on a relief from the Via Flaminia in Rome (Figs. 4, 5),¹⁴ was apparently intended to imitate the veristic portraits commissioned by the families of venerable Roman patricians of the late Republican period.¹⁵ While they are not identical in every detail, all four of these heads have prominent cheekbones, long upper lips, firmly set mouths, and sharply defined labial-nasal furrows. They are also similar in their abstract, volumetric structure and in the proliferation of linear detail as well as in certain characteristics of their technique. Sharp incisions and abrupt breaks dominate the sculptured surfaces; very little effort was made to achieve gradual transitions from one plane to another.

Among these four portraits it is clear that those from Ostia and Berlin (Figs. 2, 3) represent somewhat older men than do the Getty and Via Flaminia heads (Figs. 1, 5). No doubt each artisan who referred to a particular stereotype for general guidelines would have varied its details to conform roughly to the age and unique physiognomic peculiarities of his model either as he had observed those details directly from life or, in the case of a posthumous commission, as they had been described to him.

Despite their dependence upon a common stereotype, the dates of the four heads appear to span a considerable period of time. Schweitzer, who thought it probable that the Ostia and Berlin heads originated in the same workshop, placed both of them between 80 and 70 B.C. on the basis of their stylistic relationship to coin images of C. Coelius Caldus. The coin portrait presumably was modeled after an original sculpture of Caldus from the

ed. Philip H. de Lacey; New York 1952), 541-542, 605-606.

8) The block which was split off from a larger monument has suffered damage to the upper frame, portions of which are now missing. The frame itself shows traces of careful tooling with a claw chisel on its upper and lower surfaces, on the inner sides of the frame, and on the top of the relief as well as on the relief ground. The ground between the shoulder and the frame was left unfinished. Root hairs are visible in various places on the front of the relief.

9) See especially G. Kaschnitz von Weinberg, *Römische Bildnisse* ("Ausgewählte Schriften," II; Berlin 1965) and *Mittelmeerische Kunst* ("Ausgewählte Schriften," III; Berlin 1965) passim.

10) For a discussion of the indigenous tradition of portraiture in Rome see the present author's article, "Etruscan Influence in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome: A Study of Roman Vernacular Portraiture," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* I, iv, ed. H. Temporini (Berlin 1973), 855-870. Evidence for the late survival of this tradition is collected in the author's doctoral dissertation, *Style and Technique in the Funerary Reliefs of Late Republican Rome*, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass., 1971, Chapter V.

11) The use of a stereotype for the Getty portrait and its social implications is noted by J. Frel in the exhibition catalogue entry cited *supra*, n. 3. I am grateful to Dr. Frel for his many helpful suggestions regard-

ing the reliefs at the Getty Museum.

12) R. Calza, *I ritratti* ("Scavi di Ostia" V.i; Rome 1964), 25, no. 19, pl. XII, 19. B. Schweitzer, *Die Bildniskunst der römischen Republik* (Leipzig 1948), 60 ff., fig. 83, Caldus-Gruppe (C4), hereafter cited as Schweitzer, *Bildniskunst*. The head was detached from a relief.

13) Now lost. Formerly, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. Inv. no. 549. C. Blümel, *Römischen Bildnisse* (Staatliche Museen, Katalog der Sammlung antiker Skulpturen; Berlin 1931), 1-2, R2, pl. 2; Schweitzer, *Bildniskunst*, 60 ff., figs. 79, 82, Caldus-Gruppe (C3). This head also belonged originally to a relief.

14) Palazzo dei Conservatori, Museo Nuovo, Sala VI, Inv. no. 2231; D. Mustilli, *Il Museo Mussolini* (Rome 1939), 179, no. 74, pl. CXIX, 461; Vessberg, *Studien*, 200, 271, pl. XL, 2; H. von Heintze in W. Helbig, *Führer durch die öffentlichen Sammlungen klassischer Altertümer in Rom*, 4th rev. edition, H. Speier ed., II (Tübingen 1966), 518, no. 1640. (Hereafter cited as Helbig-Speier.)

15) The body of literature on the development of veristic Roman portraiture in the late Republican period is too extensive to cite here. For a recent summary of the issues and problems and a selected bibliography see U. Hiesinger, "Portraiture in the Roman Republic," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* I, iv, ed. H. Temporini (Berlin 1973), 805-825.

time of his consulship, c. 94 B.C.¹⁶ Vessberg's chronology would also argue for a date within the first half of the first century B.C. The harshly descriptive details of these heads correspond to the characteristics of Vessberg's "objective style" which he dates to the Caesarian era (c. 100-40 B.C.).¹⁷ The Via Flaminia head, however, cannot be as early as the first half of the century, for reasons which will be discussed below, nor can the Getty portrait because of its close relationship to the Via Flaminia relief.

The Augustan hairstyles of the men on the extreme right and left of the Via Flaminia relief (Fig. 4) and the bulging contours of all of the heads alone would indicate that the relief must date from the early Imperial period.¹⁸ The simplification of the "objective style" by means of smoother surfaces and more sharply rendered details, must have been inspired by the more classical fashion set by the portraiture of Augustus and his family. Unfortunately, a more precise date for the Via Flaminia relief is difficult to determine. Although we know that the nodus coiffure worn by the older woman on the left appeared as early as c. 43 B.C. on a coin of Victory and was adopted by Octavia, the sister of Augustus, after her marriage to Anthony in 40 or 39 B.C.,¹⁹ the same hairstyle continued to be worn particularly by older women well into the first two decades of the first century A.D., long after it had been at the height of fashion. However, one might consider the simpler hairstyle of the woman on the left of the Via Flaminia relief. Although it is partially obscured, it seems to have a central part. According to Ovid, this new fashion began to replace the older nodus coiffure in the first years of the first century A.D.,²⁰ and

it is probably to this time that the Via Flaminia relief should be assigned.

The Getty portrait (Fig. 1) must also date close to this time. It is so similar to the head of the old man on the Via Flaminia relief (Fig. 5) as to suggest that both portraits were produced in the same atelier, if not by the same hand. Their differences lie primarily in the amount of hair shown and in the relatively greater subtlety of surface modulation in the Getty portrait which can be seen in the cheeks. The latter is also somewhat squarer in contour and more elaborately furrowed with finely incised crow's feet at the corners of the eyes. Here too the hair bulges from the sides of the head recalling Augustan fashion. The gesture of *dextrarum iunctio* would corroborate such a date, since it is most readily found on reliefs of the later first century B.C. and early first century A.D.²¹ It is tempting to speculate that the Ostia and Berlin heads (Figs. 2,3) may have been earlier works from the atelier which later produced the Via Flaminia and Getty reliefs. If certain stereotypes or rule-of-thumb methods were handed down from one generation of artisans to the next, characteristics of proportion and detail such as those which these four heads have in common would have persisted in spite of changes in the prevailing fashion.

The monument inscribed with the names of Popillius and Calpurnia (Fig. 6) is in a far better state of preservation than the first Getty relief discussed. The relatively minor damage to the faces probably occurred when the block fell forward from its original position on the mausoleum wall.²² Once again, the portraits are typified rather than fully individualized likenesses. In comparing

16) Schweitzer, *Bildniskunst*, 71, assigns them to the "gemeinsame Schultradition" and (on p. 72) suggests that they are so close that they could have been created by the same master. Schweitzer regards other portraits of this Calvus-Gruppe, such as the head in the Metropolitan Museum in New York, formerly in the Stroganoff Collection (Calvus-Gruppe C5, pls. 20, 32, 80, 84), as sharing the same possible origins. (See Schweitzer, *Bildniskunst*, 70 ff.) The denarius of C. Coelius Calvus, struck by his grandson of the same name, reflects a portrait style of the period after the consulship of the elder Calvus in c. 94 B.C. according to Schweitzer (p. 60). The date of the coin itself has been placed c. 55 B.C. by Michael Crawford, *Roman Republican Coin Hoards* (Royal Numismatic Society, Special Publication no. 4; London 1969), Table XIII.

17) Vessberg, *Studien*, 166 f., 180 ff. One might also compare the characteristics of Schweitzer's "woodcut style" (Restio-Gruppe, D) which "erhebt sich auf der Stilgrundlagen Gruppe C erreicht ist." Schweitzer, *Bildniskunst*, 73.

18) The Augustan features of the Via Flaminia relief are noted by Vessberg, *Studien*, 200.

19) Vessberg, *Studien*, 246-248. This Victory type has also been identified with Fulvia, the first wife of Anthony. For Octavia, see Vessberg, *Studien*, pl. XIII, 9.

20) L. Furnée-van Zwet, "Fashion in Women's Hair-dress in the First Century of the Roman Empire," *Bulletin van de Vereeniging tot Be-*


vordering der Kennis van de Antieke Beschaving 31 (1956), 7. Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* III, 137-140 indicates that the nodus hairstyle began to be replaced by a simpler fashion with the hair parted in the middle during the first years of the first century A.D.

21) (1) Relief with three busts, formerly in the Villa Mattei, now in the Museo Nazionale Romano delle Terme, Inv. no. 80728; Vessberg, *Studien*, 198-199, 270, pl. XXXVIII, 2 with older bibliography; (2) relief with four busts, formerly on the Via Appia Antica, now in the Museo Nazionale Romano delle Terme; Vessberg, *Studien*, 199, 271, pl. XLV, 1; (3) relief in the Galleria Lapidaria of the Vatican Museums, Vessberg, *Studien*, 198, 203, 251, 272, pl. XLIII, 1; H. von Heintze in Helbig-Speier I (Tübingen, 1963), 295, no. 389 with full bibliography; (4) relief of P. Aedius and his wife, Staatliche Museen, Berlin, Inv. no. 840, *infra*, n. 33; (5) monument of the Scaevii, formerly in the Villa Casali near Via Appia, now in Copenhagen, Ny Carlsberg Glyptotek, Inv. no. 2431, Cat. 591a; V. Poulsen, *Les portraits romains I, république et dynastie julienne* (Publications de la Glyptothèque Ny Carlsberg, No. 7; Copenhagen 1962) 134-135, no. 115; (6) busts of "Cato and Portia", Vatican Museums, Sala dei Busti, Inv. no. 592; H. von Heintze in Helbig-Speier I (Tübingen 1963), 143-144, no. 199, and Vessberg, *Studien*, 204 for a later dating. Although the group is not a relief sculpture of the type under discussion, it does provide parallels for both the gesture and the male garment.

22) Except for pieces missing from the upper and left frame, there

- 4 Fragmentary Relief with Six Busts, from Via Flaminia,
Rome, Palazzo dei Conservatori, Museo Nuovo. Inst.
Neg. 36.523





- 5 Detail, Fig. 4. Photo by the author
 6 Relief of Popilius and Calpurnia, J. Paul Getty Museum
 71 AA 260. Museum Photo



the almost identical mouths of the two heads, it is evident that the craftsman relied upon an accepted standard or stock type.²³ Both Popillius and Calpurnia have close counterparts in the images on a relief in the Lateran Museum which portrays freed slaves of the Furius and Sulpicius families (Fig. 7).²⁴ Calpurnia's face strongly resembles those of all three of the Lateran women, although it is perhaps closest to that of the woman on the right (Fig. 8,9). All of these faces are highly classicized in their heavy, squarish jaws, full, curving lips, and clearly defined eyes. Even though the modeling of Calpurnia's face is far subtler and more flesh-like than that of the more simply treated Lateran heads, the fundamental stereotype upon which all of the heads depend is the same.²⁵ The model must have been female court portraiture of the Augustan period exemplified by the numerous images of Livia in her younger years.²⁶

The portrait of Popillius and those of the men on the Lateran relief all have angular outer contours, emphatic though simplified bone structures, sharply delineated features, and full heads of hair neatly arranged in individual pointed locks. As compared to the four heads of older men discussed earlier (Figs. 1,2,3,5) in which the details of that stock type were varied with greater freedom, those of Popillius and the Lateran men appear so similar as to be almost entirely mask-like and impersonal. The ideal of Augustan and Julio-Claudian male images prevails at the expense of individualized portraiture. One need only compare portraits of Augustus himself or of his immediate circle to see that the Lateran and Getty relief heads are to be distinguished from them primarily by the simpler technique in which they were rendered.²⁷ The marked resemblance among the heads on the Lateran and Getty reliefs, both male and female, strongly suggests that they are very close in date and possibly from the same workshop. While the differences in surface handling would indicate that the two reliefs

are no major breaks in the block. The portraits have suffered broken noses and chipped eyebrows, lips and chins. There are some minor abrasions on the protruding parts of the faces, hair, hands and busts, and some superficial stains on the relief ground between the busts.

23) I owe the observation to J. Frel.

24) H. von Heintze in Helbig-Speier I (Tübingen 1963), 818, no. 1139 with earlier bibliography. The surface of the sculpture has been heavily cleaned.

25) The modeling can be more readily compared with that found on a relief in Ostia which was probably carved c. 25 B.C. Calza, *op. cit.* (supra, no. 12), no. 36, pl. XXI. Modeling of this sort is not commonly found on these reliefs.

26) For portraits of Livia wearing the nodus coiffure, see V. Poulsen, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 21, no. 5), 65 ff., nos. 34-35, and references.

27) See the numerous examples of Julio-Claudian portraits in V. Poulsen, *op. cit.* (supra, no. 21, no. 5), especially p. 121, no. 89 (Cat. 566) for an early Imperial type which is very close to that which appears on the Getty and Lateran reliefs.

were carved by different craftsmen, their overall relationship to one another and to the standards of Augustan style confirm their common origin in the early Imperial period.²⁸

Neither the nodus hairstyle worn by Calpurnia, nor the clothing and composition can provide useful criteria for establishing a more exact date for the Getty relief. The poses of the figures can be found on monuments whose dates range from the very earliest appearance of this type of relief in the first quarter of the first century B.C. to a much later period.²⁹ The arrangement of Calpurnia's garments, with the tunic exposed on the right shoulder and the mantle passing over the left, occurs on numerous examples of varying date, including the one from the Via Flaminia discussed earlier (Fig. 4).³⁰ Popillius' garment is also exceedingly common on Republican tomb monuments. It is arranged as a Greek *pallium*, with a portion of the *balteus* grasped in the right hand. The motif was originally used in Greek sculpture for Sophocles and Aischines portraits, but was altered in the Hellenistic period to the more common Eretria type which was adopted by the Romans. It was intended to signify that the person represented was an educated man.³¹ Thus, while the garment is not useful for dating the monument of Popillius and Calpurnia, it contributes to an understanding of its meaning. This pose and garment would undoubtedly have been regarded by a freedman as a desirable augmentation of his social status which was implied by the portrait stereotype as well.

An early Imperial date for the relief of Popillius and Calpurnia is supported by other details such as the proportions of the frame which follow examples of that period. The inscribed lower border of the frame, which is broader than those of the sides and top, can be compared to that of the well-known relief of L. Vibius and his family from the last quarter of the first century B.C.

28) Although Vessberg, *Studien*, 196-197, pl. XXXIX, 2, would date the Lateran relief to c. 35-30 B.C., within the period of his "linear style" of the second triumvirate (pp. 196-201), other scholars place it well within the Imperial period. *Op. cit.* (supra, n. 24).

29) See Vessberg, *Studien*, for the general chronological limits.

30) Vessberg, *Studien*, pls. XXVI, 1; XXXI, 1; XXXVIII, 2; XL, 2; XLI, 1 and 2; XLII, 2; XLIII, 1 and 2.

31) On the Sophocles and Aischines types, see M. Bieber, "Roman Men in Greek Himation (Romani Palliati): A Contribution to the History of Copying," *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 103 (1959), 377; on the Eretria type, Bieber, 379-381; on the meaning of the *pallium* to the Roman citizen, Bieber, 411-416 (particularly 413). For examples of togas worn as *pallia*, Bieber, 389, figs. a-d. K. Polaschek, *Untersuchungen zu griechischen Mantelstatuen. Der Himationstypus mit Armschlinge* (diss. Berlin 1969) revises a number of interpretations given by Bieber with regard to specific sculptures. On the implication of the gesture, see G.M.A. Hanfmann, "An Etruscan Bronze," *Record of the Museum of Historic Art, Princeton University* 2 (1943), 8-9 and Brilliant, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 4), 11-13.



- 7 Relief with Five Busts, Lateran Museum
Vatican Photo Neg. IX-12-23
- 8 Detail, Fig. 7. Vatican Photo Neg. XXXII-4-41
- 9 Detail, Fig. 7. Alinari Photo 47305





10 Relief of L. Vibius and His Family, Vatican, Museo Chiaramonti. Vatican Photo Neg. XXXI-10-90

11 Relief of P. Aedius and His Wife, Staatliche Museen, Berlin. Museum Photo SK 5492



(Fig. 10).³² A relief of the early first century A.D., that of P. Aedius P.l. Amphio in Berlin (Fig. 11), corresponds even more directly in that the format of its inscription is also similar.³³

The details of execution observable in the relief of Popillius and Calpurnia are worthy of some attention, since they mark the relief as somewhat unusual in technical character as compared to the majority of such funerary monuments. The first Getty relief discussed (Fig. 1) more closely approaches the norm. In contrast to the more clearly abstract structure of the first relief, the stereometry of the heads of Popillius and Calpurnia is modified by the suggestion of an organic relationship between pliant flesh and an underlying skeletal structure. In this respect, it may also be distinguished from the more hardened surface handling of the Lateran heads. The portraits of Popillius and Calpurnia, which retain a considerable degree of roughness, linearity and abstraction, are evidently the work of a native Roman craftsman. Other details such as the uncertain anatomy of the shoulders and arms, especially evident in Calpurnia's boneless wrist, are further signs of local workmanship. Distortions of this kind are common and often more severe in the work of the average Roman artisans whose lack of interest in anatomical correctness derives directly from the Etruscan tradition. However, this artisan's modeling technique, as well as his attempt to portray the organic structure of the heads, must have owed much to the influence of contemporary Hellenistic sculptors in Rome whose ability to render organic effects in sculpture is well-known.³⁴ The logical and varied folds of the drapery which reveal the bodies beneath also indicate some Hellenistic influence. However, the folds were carved hastily with a flat chisel, rather than with a drill according to the standard Hellenistic method for undercutting folds,³⁵ again indicative of practices common to the indigenous Roman workshops.

The Getty Museum is fortunate to possess these two important examples of Roman portraiture from the early Imperial period. While the portrait bust of the relief fragment (Fig. 1) represents Roman vernacular art in its fully characteristic form, those of Popillius and Calpurnia (Fig. 6) admirably demonstrate that Hellenistic

sculptural technique had influenced certain workshops of that indigenous tradition. Taken together, the two reliefs provide insight into the significance of these reliefs while also revealing something of the character of the sculpture industry in Rome during a crucial period in the development of Roman artistic expression. The use of portrait stereotypes which reflect aristocratic Roman images clearly indicates that these "portraits" were principally declarations of the newly gained status of freedmen in Roman society and only secondarily records of the features of specific individuals. For the sculpture industry the Getty reliefs illustrate that fruitful contact was established between some native craftsmen and the transplanted Hellenistic sculptors. The full extent of that interchange and its effect upon the development of Roman portrait styles will only be assessed from further study of monuments from both of these traditions.

Elaine K. Gazda
University of Michigan

32) Vatican Museums, Museo Chiaramonti, Inv. no. 2109; W. Amelung, *Die Skulpturen des Vaticanischen Museums I* (Berlin 1903), 348, no. 60E, pl. 36; Vessberg, *Studien*, 201-202, pl. XLI, 3; H. von Heintze in Helbig-Speier I (Tübingen 1963), 291-292, no. 381; C.I.L. VI, 4, 28874.

33) C.I.L. VI, 2 11284/85; C. Blümel, *op. cit.* (supra, n. 13), 3-4, R7, pl. 4; Vessberg, *Studien*, 203-204, pl. XLIII, 2. Vessberg would date this relief as late as the 20's A.D. in part because of the hairstyle worn by the woman which is that of Livia as Salus Augusta (known on coins of A.D. 21-22) and in part because of the highly developed realism of

Aedius' portrait which Vessberg claims approaches Flavian "impressionism." (p. 204)

34) The present author has discussed the matter of Hellenistic influence upon the native Roman sculptural tradition in the article cited supra, n. 10.

35) S. Adam, *The Technique of Greek Sculpture in the Archaic and Classical Periods* (The British School of Archaeology at Athens, Suppl. Vol. no. 3; London 1966), 67, for the Hellenistic method of carving drapery with a running drill.

The Arundel "Homerus" Rediscovered

When in 1691 the seventh Duke of Norfolk determined to dispose of all the Arundel marbles still in his possession, he gave a number of the more ruinous pieces to a former family-servant named Boyder (or Boydell) Cooper, who had opened a pleasure garden on the Thames-side at Lambeth and needed ornaments for it. In this establishment, popularly known as Cupid's Gardens, the sculptures remained neglected and forgotten for some thirty years, until in 1719 a brief notice drawing attention to their plight appeared in Vol. V of John Aubrey's *Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey*, together with engravings of twenty-seven pieces on eight plates. Shortly afterwards two friends, John Freeman of Fawley Court, Henley-on-Thames, and Edmund Waller of Hall Barn, Beaconsfield, prevailed upon the then owner of Cupid's Gardens to sell the collection, and divided it between them.¹

Among the pieces acquired by Freeman in this division was the draped male torso illustrated on the right of Aubrey's Plate V (Fig. 1), which is still to be seen at Fawley Court (Fig. 2).² The material is a coarse-grained, whitish marble, which looks to me Anatolian. The torso has been broken off below along a line just above the knees and the fractured surface is now embedded in a concrete base. The greatest height is 118.5 cm, the width at the elbows 62 cm and the depth from back to front at the level of the hips 51 cm. Head and neck were carved from a separate block of marble and inserted in a bowl-like cavity between the shoulders; roughly oval in outline (25 cm x 19 cm), this cavity has at its centre an irregular depression containing a rectangular dowel hole. At the top of the right arm a steeply-sloping area has been dressed flat and lightly picked to receive a small, separately-carved piece which is now missing: evidently a repair, but an ancient one, to judge from the tooling of the joint. A little further down this arm, just above the edge of the drapery, is a small dowel-hole. In general the torso is better preserved at the back and on the left side; the front and right side are badly weathered and the arrises of many of the folds are crumbling or broken.

The back of the left hand is split away. A channel for a vertical cramp behind the legs and a dowel-hole in the bottom of the left thigh testify to a former restoration of the lower part of the figure.

The torso is all that survives of one of the most celebrated of the Arundel statues: the so-called Homerus.³ The known history of this statue begins in Rome between 1600 and 1608 when Rubens made a drawing of it now in the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett (KdZ 10601, Fig. 3); later he used the figure as a model for that of Chronos in his "Gouvernement de la Reine".⁴ We do not know when Arundel acquired the statue, but it was presumably while visiting Rome in 1613-14; at all events, it had already been installed in Arundel House in London when in 1618 Daniel Mytens painted a portrait of the earl sitting at the entrance of his new Italianate sculpture-gallery, within which the Homerus can be seen standing against the right hand wall, the fourth statue from the far corner (Fig. 4).⁵ Not long after the completion of the gallery a number of Arundel statues including the Homerus were drawn, presumably as a commission from the earl,⁶ by Jacob de Gheyn the Younger (1596-1644), who probably visited London in 1618 and certainly did so in 1622. Gheyn's drawings have not survived, but they were eventually engraved by Johannes Episcopus (Jan de Bisschop, 1628-71) for the second part of his *Signorum Veterum Icones*, published by Nicolas Vischer at Amsterdam in the sixties of the seventeenth century. The Homerus is represented in this work by two engravings after de Gheyn, one showing it from the front and the other from the right side, the latter view being reversed (Fig. 5). In addition to Rubens' sketch the Berlin Kupferstichkabinett possesses a drawing of the statue by an anonymous Dutch artist (KdZ 12166, Fig. 6). Described by Bock and Rosenberg as being in the manner of Artus van Quellinus the Elder (1609-1668),⁷ it is weaker than the Rubens, but perhaps more faithful to the original: compare, for example, the rendering of the drapery over the left shoulder.

1) For the story of the dispersal of the Arundel marbles see A. Michaelis *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain* pp. 32-43; D. Haynes in *Archaeology* 21, 1968, pp. 206-211 and *Apollo*, July 1972, pp. 6-11.

2) Fawley Court is now the seat of a Polish Catholic boys' school, the Divine Mercy College. Through the kind intervention of the Rector of the College, Father Andrew Janicki, the Congregation of Marian Fathers has generously given me permission to publish the torso, which at the time of writing is on loan to the Ashmolean Museum, Oxford. For photographs and permission to reproduce them I am greatly indebted to the Trustees of the British Museum (Figs. 1 & 5), to the Visitors of the Ashmolean Museum (Fig. 2), to Dr. Peter Dreyer, Berlin Kupferstichkabinett (Figs. 3 and 6) and to His Grace The Duke of Norfolk, E.M., K.G. (Fig. 4).

3) R. and E. Boehringer *Homer* pp. 136-138; K. Schefold in *Die Antike*

XVI, 1940, p. 250; V. Poulsen in *Acta Arch.* XI, 1940, pp. 154-160; C. Picard *Manuel IV*, 2, pp. 662-665; J. Hess in *English Miscellany* I, 1950, p. 202; T. Dohrn in *Jdl* LXX, 1955, pp. 74-78; G. Richter, *Portraits of the Greeks* I, p. 52; C. Vermeule in *The Classical Journal* LXV, No. 4, Jan. 1970, p. 191. The identification of the Fawley Court torso with the Arundel 'Homerus' as drawn by Jacob de Gheyn and Rubens was first suggested to me by Prof. Dr. and Mrs. J. G. van Gelder of Utrecht University, to whom I am much indebted.

4) R. and E. Boehringer *Homer*, pll. 109, 110. The connection was first noticed by H. Kauffmann.

5) For the attribution to Mytens rather than van Somer see M.F.S. Hervey, *Thomas Howard*, p. 142.

6) Hess, *op. cit.*, pp. 204 f.

7) E. Bock and J. Rosenberg, Staatl. Museen Berlin, *Die Niederländischen Meister*, p. 218.



1 Three ancient sculptures in Cupid's Gardens, Lambeth (Aubrey, *Natural History and Antiquities of Surrey*, Vol. V, 1719, Pl. V).



2a-d Four views of the Fawley Court torso



The statue represents a bearded man of robust middle age standing with his hands interlocked across his chest⁸ and looking to the left with upturned glance. His weight rests on his right leg, his left being set to the side with the knee bent and the foot touching the ground with the toes only. He wears chiton, himation and sandals. The chiton reaches almost to the knees and its upper corners fall sideways over the shoulders to form short false sleeves; the dowel-hole at the top of the right arm might perhaps have held some kind of button or link added in bronze, though I know of no parallel. One corner of the himation is bunched up under the left forearm, the elbow being pulled back a little, and the shoulder raised, in the action of holding it fast there. The rest of the garment, its top edge turned over in a roll, is then carried across the front of the body and round under the right arm to the back, whence another corner is thrown forward over the left shoulder and hangs down to mid-thigh, passing under the clasped hands. In its diagonal fall the himation leaves the left leg bare to above the knee but covers the right leg almost to the ankle. The thick-soled sandals have uppers cut to form thongs passing over the instep and around the ankles; and the enlarged sketch which Rubens made of the left-hand sandal in the margin of his sheet, shows that the overlaps of the tongues were shaped like hanging calyces. Behind the legs, but rather closer to the right than the left, is a support in the form of a twisting tree-trunk.⁹

Did the statue really represent Homer, as seems to have been generally believed in Arundel's day? In Epi-scopius' engravings the name "Homerus" appears inscribed in lapidary letters on the statue-base, but the inscription, if it really was there, must surely have been modern, for it would be very surprising for an ancient inscription to give the poet's name in its Latinized form. As, however, the name reads from left to right in the reversed side-view as well as in the front-view, it seems much more likely that it was fictitiously added by the engraver in deference to the prevailing opinion. This does not imply, of course, that the prevailing opinion was necessarily wrong. In general type the statue would certainly be suitable for a Homer; indeed it bears a considerable resemblance to the Homer who stands between the Iliad and Odyssey on a sarcophagus-end of Sidamara type in the Louvre;¹⁰ stance and poise of the head are very similar in the two figures. They differ, it is true, in

8) With only the seventeenth-century illustrations to go on, the Boehringer and Dohrn doubted the antiquity of the clasped hands, but the torso vindicates it.

9) Rubens not very happily masks most of the support with inexplicable drapery.

10) Richter, *op. cit.*, fig. 117; M. Wegner *Musensarkophage* pp. 37 f,

the position of their arms, the sarcophagus Homer holding a rotulus in his left hand and fingering his beard with his right. But the interlocked hands of the statue would be no less appropriate to the poet, expressing, as they do, contemplation and compassion. Cedrenus describes a bronze statue of Homer in the Zeuxippos at Constantinople as having 'the hands clasped under the chest,' though Christodorus describing the same statue says that they 'rested one upon the other on a stick'.¹¹

We cannot be absolutely sure that the head shown in the seventeenth-century illustrations of the statue is original, but it has every appearance of being so. Vagn Poulsen¹² compared it with a marble portrait-herm in the Capitoline Museum¹³ and tentatively connected both with a hypothetical statue of Homer by Lysippus, but the many obvious discrepancies between the two seem to me to outweigh the isolated and not very precise correspondences he notes in Rubens' rendering of the beard and hair, which must surely be fortuitous. On the other hand, the Arundel "Homerus" certainly has something in common with the "Apollonius of Tyana" Homer, which Poulsen believed to be a later adaptation of the type represented by the Capitoline herm. The treatment of the forehead and brows is strikingly similar;¹⁴ and, as the Boehringers have pointed out,¹⁵ the Berlin drawing KdZ 12166 suggests that, as in the Apollonius type, the beard had a central parting. In the absence of the head itself anything like certainty is, of course, unattainable, but on balance Homer seems to me a more likely candidate than anyone else, Sieveking's suggestion¹⁶ that the statue might represent Antisthenes is unconvincing. None of the illustrations gives any hint of the philosopher's highly characteristic mouth with its overhanging moustache and receding underlip.¹⁷

Close parallels for the Arundel "Homerus" are to be sought, but in its torsional composition and the pathos of the head it may legitimately be compared, I think, with the under life-sized marble statue of a bearded god—Poseidon more probably than Zeus—from the

No. 76, pll. 19b and 91a. Wegner questions the identification of the figure as Homer, but it is hard to see who else it could be.

11) Cedrenus *Historiarum Compendium* p. 369 D: Τὸ χεῖρε συζευχας ὑπὸ τὰ στήθια. Christodorus *Ecphr.*, Anth. Pal. II, 1.343 f: ἀμφοτέρωθεν δὲ / χεῖρας ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι τιθεὶς ἐπερείδετο ῥάβδῳ.

12) *Op. cit.* pp. 156-160.

13) Stuart Jones, *Cat.* pp. 321 f, no. 30; Schefold *Bildnisse* p. 88, no. 2.

14) Cf. in particular Richter *op. cit.* figs. 25-27 (Capitoline Museum), 37-39 (Madrid) and 49-51 (Naples).

15) *Op. cit.* p. 138. Poulsen, *op. cit.* p. 154, rightly disputes the Boehringers' statement that the head drawn by the follower of Quellinus is not the same as that drawn by Rubens and Jakob de Gheyn.

16) *Phil. Wochenschrift* 12 July, 1941, col. 349.

17) Richter, *op. cit.* II, figs. 1037-1055.

- 3 The Arundel Homerus. Pencil sketch by Rubens in the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin (KdZ 10601).



- 4 Thomas Howard, Earl of Arundel, at the entrance of his sculpture-gallery. Oil-painting by Daniel Mytens, 1618 (Arundel Castle).



5a,b Two views of the Arundel Homerus, engraved by Johannes Episcopus after drawings by Jakob de Gheyn the Younger (Episcopus, *Signorum Veterum Icones*, Pl. 72 and 71).

6 The Arundel Homerus. Pencil sketch in the Kupferstichkabinett, Berlin (KdZ 12166).



House of Dionysus on Delos.¹⁸ The Delos statue has been generally recognized as a Hellenistic work in the Lysippic tradition; and such surely the "Homerus" must be. To attempt to date it more closely would no doubt be rash; but my own impression is that its affinities are with Pergamene baroque rather than with the immediate succession of Lysippus. It is in any case almost certainly a Greek original, not a Roman copy. On the left side and back of the torso, where the drapery folds are still comparatively well preserved, they show a freshness and sensitivity in their modelling, and a feeling for volume, which are far removed from the mechanical dryness characteristic of the Roman copyist's work.

Denys Haynes
British Museum

18) *BCH* XXX, 1906, p. 556 f, fig. 21 (J. Chamonard); *Delos* VIII, 1, p. 220, fig. 96; H. Süsserott *Griechische Plastik des 4. Jahrhunderts* p. 168; G. Lippold *Gr. Plastik* p. 288; Picard, *op. cit.* pp. 511 f, fig. 210.

Apollo by Kephisodotos The Elder

The recent appearance in the sculpture display of the new J. Paul Getty Museum at Malibu of a famous but little appreciated head of Apollo (Fig. 1) is a welcome addition to this country's art collections and prompts a first publication of a related Apollo head in the Walters Art Gallery, Baltimore (Figs. 2-3). Besides the obvious similarity of feature, the heads share the ignominy of having been exposed for long periods on female torsos where they might claim to be the ugliest faces imaginable. Now, recognized, detached and presented as masculine, they have become respectable documents on Greek art stemming from the elder Kephisodotos who was active at the beginning of the fourth century B.C. The Getty head, on loan from the Los Angeles County Museum,¹ was for a century in the Lansdowne Collection in London, dispersed at auction in 1930, where it completed a statue of Artemis, while that now in Baltimore crowned a draped female figure, hardly identifiable but perhaps a Muse, in the Massarenti Collection in Rome which was sold *in toto* to Mr. Henry Walters in 1902.²

The Walters head is crystalline white marble, perhaps Pentelic, that has developed a crack running from the right side of the crown to the left jaw (Fig. 2). The nose has broken and been restored and there are slight abrasions of the upper lip and the left eyebrow. The mouth is small and the lower part of the face very broad. Above a triangular forehead the parted hair mass rises almost vertically and from the part the locks extend away from the face in undulations deeply cut with the drill; the drill marks become quite horizontal before the ears (Fig. 3). The hair is restrained by a double band which disappears behind a bun of long hair on the neck; in contrast to the ebullient hair before the band, that behind is smooth and delicately waved. There were no escaping strands to fall on the shoulders.

The Getty head (Fig. 1) has the same features: broad lower face, triangular forehead, parted hair rising vertically from the forehead in a mass, the locks sweeping to the sides and deeply drilled horizontally. Minor damages mar the nose and upper lip. It differs from the Walters head in having remains of one long lock behind each ear, once long enough to rest on the shoulders. The back which suggested long hair to Furtwängler, seemed

a means of attachment to a herm to Lippold and Picard; according to Jiri Frel, there is no sign of such attachment.

These two heads are not the same size and therefore cannot both be point copies of the same original. The total height of the Getty head is 29.9 centimeters, the Walters head 27.3, the neck breaks occurring at about the same height in both. More conclusive are the following measurements: chin to hair-line, Getty 20.85, Walters 18; right corner of mouth to outside corner of right eye, Getty 8.7, Walters 7; left corner of mouth to outside corner of left eye, Getty 8.5, Walters 6.8.

Both heads belong to what Savignoni wisely called not a type but a family of statues when he first published a colossal statue of Apollo Pythios (chin to hair-line 30 centimeters!) in 1907, shortly after its excavation in his sanctuary in Gortyn, Crete.³ That Apollo wears a long peplos like Artemis', the heavy garment falling in box pleats, and an under chiton visible only on the right arm. Covering the back is a chlaina pinned at the shoulders. The head, separately made and inserted but obviously belonging, has hollow sockets which now leer frighteningly but once held eyes of colored stone, long curls at the sides, and a back that is unfinished but seems intended for long hair. Found alone it might easily be taken for feminine.

Savignoni went on to collate the replicas and near replicas of the Gortyn Apollo establishing the fact that the type required a kithar on the left arm and a plektron for playing it in the right hand. He did not mention the Lansdowne Artemis-Apollo since its identification as Artemis was still unchallenged. He included a large statue in the Vatican which had been restored as Minerva with a helmet in her (false) right hand and an olive branch in the left, equally false. It surely is an Apollo and the head is very like the Walters head with the same forehead and chin and hair combed the same way in front and gathered in a bun at the back; the costume is chiton, peplos and chlaina surrounding the body and buttoned to itself on the right shoulder with a point falling to knee height in front. Unfortunately the head is again inset but Savignoni argued convincingly that it belongs. Amelung in the volume of the Vatican catalogue⁴ which appeared almost immediately after Savig-

1) F. de Clarac, *Musée de sculpture*, 1841, IV, pl. 564 A, no. 1213 a; S. Reinach, *Répertoire de la statuaire grecque et romaine* I, 1897, p. 301; A. Michaelis, *Ancient Marbles in Great Britain*, 1882, pp. 455 f., no. 67; L. R. Farnell, *Cults of the Greek States* II, 1896, pl. XXXIV; A. Furtwängler, *Über Statuenkopieen im Alterthum*, 1896, p. 51 = *Abhandlungen der k. bayer. Akademie der Wiss.*, I. Cl., XX. Bd., III. Abth., p. 575; P. Arndt, W. Amelung, *Photographische Einzelaufnahmen antiker Skulpturen*, nos. 4912, 4913; G. Lippold, *Die griechische Plastik* (R. Herbig, *Handbuch der Archäologie* V) 1950, p. 225,

note 2; C. Picard, *Manuel d'archéologie grecque. La sculpture*, III, 1, 1948, p. 63, fig. 14 and pp. 123 f.


2) Walters Art Gallery, no. 23.208, formerly part of 23.93. U. and M.P., *Catalogue du Musée de peinture, sculpture et archéologie au Palais Accoramboni*, pt. II, Rome, 1897, p. 144, no. 18.

3) L. Savignoni, "Apollo Pythios," in *Ausonia* II, 1907, pp. 16-66.

4) W. Amelung, *Die Sculpturen des vaticanischen Museums*, II, 1908, pp. 433 ff., no. 259, pl. 47. Ht. 2.14 m., no head measurements. Savignoni, *op. cit.*, p. 43, note 1, gives .43 for head and neck, .28 from chin to hairline.



1 Head of Apollo. J. Paul Getty Museum L73.AA.1a. On loan from Los Angeles County Museum of Art, William Randolph Hearst collection.



2,3 Head of Apollo. Walters Art Gallery 23.208



noni's article expressed no doubt that the subject was Apollo and only restrained scepticism about its belonging to the statue. This last named Apollo head is the closest to the Walters head but again we must admit that we are not dealing with point copies of the same original, if only because the Vatican head is much larger.

In this same article Savignoni for the first time connected the Apollo family with Kephisodotos the elder whose one certain work was the Eirene with child Ploutos, preserved in a complete point copy in Munich and in various fragmentary replicas.⁵ As a digression he pointed up resemblances of this work to various creations of Praxiteles, Kephisodotos' son. The resemblance of the Apollo heads and the drapery of the Gortyn type to the Eirene is patent; and not long afterwards Anna Kaltenhauser⁶ came to the same conclusion in a study of the folds of the peplos of the Eirene and the Gortyn Apollo. Somewhat later Lippold published the Getty (Lansdowne) head and the Artemis torso to which it was affixed, claiming the head for a copy of Kephisodotos' Apollo Kitharoidos though, as has been said, he thought it from a herm. Finally, Picard, in his comprehensive work on Greek sculpture, accepted the Getty head as a copy of the Kephisodotan Apollo, along with other attributions, including a bearded and draped Dionysos, so-called "Sardanapalos."

No literary text connects Apollo with Kephisodotos. The attribution rests solely on the resemblance of the Gortyn statue and others to the Eirene, for which there is literary evidence (Pausanias I,8,2 and IX,16,2). Yet the assumption that he made an Apollo is historically probable. There were two groups of Muses on Mt. Helikon (Pausanias IX,30,1) of which one, the earliest known composition with nine Muses, was his work while the other included three of his creations. It is not preposterous to suppose that Kephisodotos had an interest in the subject and that some sanctuary housed his Apollo *Kitharoidos* and *Musagetes*.

At this moment it is impossible to be absolutely sure which Apollo is closest to Kephisodotos, is, in fact, a Roman point copy of his masterpiece. Was it colossal with masses of long hair like the Apollo of Gortyn or medium sized with long side curls like the Getty head,

or without hanging locks like the small Walters head or the larger former Minerva in the Vatican? But that the famous sculptor created a masterpiece upon which later draped Apollo statues were based is certain. A mere generation later Euphranor was commissioned to make an Apollo Patroos for a temple in the Agora at Athens and what we believe to be the actual Greek original is a torso found there in 1907,⁷ just when Savignoni was working on the Gortyn statue. It is long robed and kithar bearing like Kephisodotos' Apollo, the only substantial difference being the weight distribution, for Apollo Patroos has the weight on the left leg. The peplos folds are freer and not "box pleated." The peplos is girded in the same way, the chlaina is the same, the kithar position is the same. There remains none of the chiton and, most regrettably, no head. There was long hair resting on the shoulders and falling freely down the back. Of several free replicas, most have no head, but there is one large Roman copy with a head—separately made and inserted.⁸ It is easily distinguished from its forebear, the Kephisodotan heads of which the Getty head and that in the Walters Art Gallery convey some impression, however inadequate.

Dorothy Kent Hill
The Walters Art Gallery

5) Best illustrations: G. E. Rizzo, *Prassitele*, 1932, pls. I-III and VI-VIII (reconstruction); head, Mustilli, *Enciclopedia dell'arte antica* IV, 1964, s.v. *Kephisodotos*, p. 342, fig. 405. H. K. Süsserott dates the original Eirene 380-370 B.C.: *Griechische Plastik des 4. Jahrhunderts vor Christus*, 1938, pp. 141 ff., but Savignoni, *op. cit.*, p. 34, note 4, held out for the once accepted date of 403 B.C.

6) A. Kaltenhauser, *Studien zu handwerkliche Gestaltung in attischen Grabreliefs des 5. und 4. Jahrhunderts vor Christus*, 1911, p. 36.

7) *Αρχ. Δελτ.* 1916, παρ. 79 f., fig. 4; *ibidem* 1929, p. 95, note 1; H. A. Thompson, *Hesperia* 6, 1937, pp. 107 ff. and Thompson, 'Αρχ. Εφ.

1953-54, pt. 3 (1959), pp. 30 ff.; Thompson and Wycherley, *Athenian Agora* XIV, 1972, p. 139; Picard, *op. cit.*, III, 2, 1948, pp. 859 ff., fig. 385 (remarks on relation of head to Praxitelean types).

8) G. Lippold, *Die Skulpturen des vaticanischen Museums*, III, 1, 1936, pp. 184 ff., no. 582, pl. 51. Savignoni, *op. cit.*, p. 22, no. 1, considered it a member of the Gortyn Apollo "family." See also M. O. Deubner, *Hellenistische Apollongestalten*, 1934, p. 9. The doubts of the long-robed Kitharoidos' having existed in the fourth century, echoed but not accepted by S. Dow, *AJA* 78, 1974, p. 295, are refuted by the evidence assembled by Picard, *op. cit.*, III, 2, pp. 860 ff.

Throughout most of the fifth century B.C. Attic craftsmen exported fine red-figure plastic vases to a receptive market in Southern Italy. Favored among these were the animal-head rhyta used, not as actual drinking vessels, but as part of the funerary *mobilier*. Toward the end of the century Attic workshops stopped turning out the rhyta, but it seems that Tarentine potters began their own production of the animal-heads during the first quarter of the fourth century in order to satisfy the continuing local demand. They initially strove to reproduce the Attic models either by painstaking freehand imitation or by means of moulds taken directly from the imported pieces. Shortly after the middle of the century, Apulian craftsmen started modifying these moulds and soon had even modelled some original patrices. By the third quarter of the century, Italiote animal-head rhyta, although still essentially derivative products, possessed a distinctive character of their own.

Significant scholarly attention has been paid to Apulian rhyta. Herbert Hoffmann, for one, established a typological and chronological framework for the plastic heads, within which, as we shall see, it is possible to add new material. In this article all mention of series and groups is in reference to his system.¹ From another vantage point, Trendall's monumental work on Apulian vase painters² will be an invaluable aid in further classifying specific rhyta. His approach is important because, given the constant re-use of the moulds, there was often a hiatus, sometimes of decades, between the creation of the original mould or patrix and the actual completion and decoration of a particular piece. Thus, knowledge of the date of both the plastic head and its painting contributes to a fuller understanding of the chronology of Italiote rhyta.

There are four examples of unpublished Tarentine

rhyta in the J. Paul Getty Museum.³ All were purchased on the New York art market in 1971. One piece, a relatively early ram-head rhyton⁴ (Figs. 1-3), manifests some significant elements of originality. The potter made a mould, either from an Attic late fifth century Persian-class rhyton or, more probably, from a direct Tarentine descendant of it (e.g. Figs. 4 and 5).⁵ He then proceeded to re-fashion the pliable form. (The appearance of the interior of the rhyton, which precisely follows the exterior, confirms the use of this procedure.) His most noticeable deviation from the model was the transformation of ordinary ram horns into large snail-shaped protuberances unprecedented in the Attic or Apulian repertory. He went on to modify the head by increasing the space between the horns, by making circularly protruding eyes, a bulging muzzle, and a markedly triangular forehead without the traditional fleece. A profile view (Fig. 2) reveals that the chin bottom is now sharply pinched up; before modification this was not the case. The potter individualized his ram after it was cast by angling the unscored ears almost ninety degrees to the head, instead of flush with the horns as was customary. The end result is a visually striking ram head, thus far, the only one of its kind.

From the painting, executed in a style close to the Iliupersus Painter,⁶ this ram-head rhyton can be dated shortly after 350 B.C. An athlete holding a scraper in his raised right hand adorns the front of the bowl. Two horizontal palmettes flank the figure, with white dots below it. There is a pair of ivy leaves, also in added white, near the top of the bowl and waves surround its rim.

The Getty bull-head rhyton⁷ (Figs. 6-8) was surely created by the same potter who made the ram. Following a similar working pattern, he used an existing rhyton as a matrix (in this instance an Attic vase; see, for example,

I wish to express my gratitude to Dr. Jiří Frel who led me to the Italiote rhyta, and whose invaluable counsel, patience, constant encouragement and hard work made this article possible. I would also like to thank Professor A. D. Trendall for his time and his opinions. Finally, I am grateful to Dion E. Sargatz who photographed and developed the prints of the Getty rhyta reproduced herein.

1) H. Hoffmann, *Tarentine Rhyta*, Mainz, 1966. Hoffmann theorizes that the Apulian potter had no role in the creation of the plastic part of the rhyta. He proposes the existence of a group of coroplasts who made moulds and patrices for the potters. The latter, thus, would have only pulled the bowls and made the added parts of these vases. Hoffmann does, however, believe that Attic potters were responsible for their own modelling. It is unclear why he sees Apulian potters as unable to make moulds and do even elementary modelling, while he considers the Attic potters to be sculptors. Certainly, there are unusual cases in the South Italian production where the high quality of the animal head suggests the work of a modeller of extraordinary skill and sensitivity (e.g. Naples horse-head rhyton, Naples Museo Nazionale, Stg. 66, Hoffmann, plate II), but as K. Schauenburg, *Gymnasium*, LXXIV, 561-563 points out in his review of *Tarentine Rhyta*, Hoffmann's argument for the separate

coroplast remains an unconvincing one.

2) This work is not yet published, but relevant information was made available to me.



3) 71.AE.195, 71.AE.196, 71.AE.296, 71.AE.266. Three of these were briefly mentioned in the Pennsylvania State University, College of Arts and Architecture publication, *Selected Works from the Ancient Art Collection of the John Paul Getty Museum*, Malibu, California, 1971, and in the pamphlet by J. Frel and S. Holo, *South Italian Vases, An Exhibition at the J. Paul Getty Museum*, [1974], 28.

4) J. Paul Getty Museum, no. 71.AE.195; length 19.5 cm.; diameter 9.5 to 10 cm.; recomposed, with some restoration, from fragments; right ear missing.

5) British Museum, F425; early group, series A. Dated 380-70 B.C. by A. Oliver, *Erasmus*, XIX, 1967, 728-731. Photographs courtesy of the British Museum.

6) Attribution kindly confirmed verbally by A. D. Trendall.

7) J. Paul Getty Museum, no. 71.AE.196; length 19.3 cm., diameter 9.3 to 9.5 cm.; broken and recomposed, with some restoration in the painting; left ear missing; early group, series H.



1-3 Ram-head rhyton, J. Paul Getty Museum 71.AE.195

4-5 Attic ram-head rhyton, British Museum F425



6-8 Bull-head rhyton, J. Paul Getty Museum 71.AE.196

Figs. 9 and 10).⁸ He proceeded to re-model the mould, handling the clay much as he did in the first case. This is particularly evident in the lower chin area, pinched up just as it is in the ram-head. The strongly modelled dewlap on the Apulian rhyton represents another change from the Attic prototype. The bull's ears, although larger than the ram's, are attached in the same way and are also left unscored at the edges. The potter probably left them plain to emphasize further the affinities between the two rhyta. Other examples from this series of bull-heads all have scored ears. Finally, there are strong resemblances in the shapes of the bowls and handles of the two rhyta.

The paintings on the ram and the bull are stylistically similar, suggesting that they were executed by the same hand. This is especially obvious in detail photographs of the two figures on the bowls of the rhyta (see Figs. 11 and 12). On the bull, a dancing maenad holding a tympanum embellishes the front of the vase; two ivy leaves appear in added white near the top of the bowl; waves surround the rim; and once more, a band of white dots is below the figure. In both cases the white dots serve as the ground line for the figures above. They also perform the function (usually fulfilled by a solid band or bands) of separating the plastic head from the bowl. The painter seems, thus, to be emphasizing the close relationship between the two rhyta by both the choice and disposition of his ornamentation. Indeed, the many plastic and decorative similarities between the bull and the ram-head rhyta indicate that they were conceived as a pair. As they were purchased together, they were probably found side by side in one grave.

Unlike the first two rhyta, the Laconian-hound head⁹ (Figs. 13 and 14) adheres strictly to an Attic prototype. Hoffmann brings our attention to the probable matrix, a fifth century Persian Class rhyton excavated at Ruvo and now in the Museo Jatta.¹⁰ Paintings on the bowls of the Italiote Laconian hounds reveal that South Italian potters and painters created this type of animal-head rhyton for at least twenty years. The earliest samples are from shortly after 350 B.C. The Getty rhyton, decorated by someone within the circle of the Darius Painter, was probably made about 340 B.C.¹¹ On it, a young satyr

8) Boston Museum of Fine Arts, no. 01.8105. Photographs courtesy of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts.

9) J. Paul Getty Museum, no. 71.AE.296; length 19.5 cm., diameter 9.3 cm.; intact (bowl cracked and glued together); early group, series A.

10) Hoffmann, 50. There are no available photographs of the Attic vase to which he refers.

11) This attribution was made verbally by A. D. Trendall.

12) J. Paul Getty Museum, 71.AE.266; length 19.6 cm.; diameter 9.5 cm.; intact except for the tips of the ears which are broken off. This

walks toward his left, holding a filled plate and a thyrsus; an egg pattern is on the rim and two palmettes are diagonally placed at the sides; scattered ornaments are near his feet, and a solid line serving to separate the head from the bowl also refers to the figure's ground. The painting, compared to that on the bull- and the ram-heads (see details, Figs. 11, 12, and 15) is of relatively high quality: the nude body is rendered with greater sureness and elegance, the ornamentation executed with more precision. However, before the vase was fired, it was pressed against something and the plastic head was deformed. Fortunately, this accident did not keep the otherwise fine Laconian hound from the marketplace.

The female goat-head rhyton (Figs 16-17)¹² illustrates the decline of Italiote rhyton production. Judging from the painting and the pottery work of early castings from this mould, the first pieces date about 320 B.C. Several factors, however, indicate that the Getty piece was not made until the turn of the century. The most obvious indication of this is that the rhyton was left undecorated, a common practice with late issue from a mould. Its simple white slip, now mostly disappeared, is characteristic of rhyta made ca. 300, after the red-figure style of decoration had vanished in Apulia. Equally indicative of lateness is the poor quality of the pottery, thick walled and unfinished on the inside. Furthermore, the slightness of the goat's head is the result of shrinkage from generations of reproduction. And, finally, the poorly modelled plastic head, more worn on one side than the other, shows clear signs of having been worked and re-worked over the years. This she-goat, then, is clearly an example of Apulia's thoroughly devitalized rhyton production.

We turn now to three unpublished rhyta from other collections.

A Maltese lapdog-head in the Newark Museum represents the fully developed phase of Italiote rhyton production (see Figs. 18-19).¹³ Although there are no extant Attic rhyta of this type, the Apulian potters apparently derived the dog-head from an Attic model. A comparison of one of the earliest of these Italiote Maltese lapdog rhyta with later examples indicates that the usual process was followed: the early rhyton is typically Attic in its proportions and appearance while the later pieces,

rhyton belongs to main group, series D, categorized by Hoffmann as a sheep. Although sheep and goats are similar in the Apulian repertory, series D does seem to be closer to the latter than to the former.

It is possible that the original source for the she-goat rhyton may have been an Apulian-made patrix, but it seems more likely that it derived from the head of a male goat, perhaps Hoffmann's main group, series C (see *Tarentine Rhyta*, plate XV).

13) Newark Museum 69.166; known to me only in photographs. Photographs courtesy of the Newark Museum.



9-10 Attic bull-head rhyton, Boston Museum of Fine Arts 01.8105



11 Detail from Figs. 1-3




12 Detail from Figs. 6-8



15 Detail from Figs. 13-14



13-14 Hound-head rhyton, J. Paul Getty Museum 71.AE.296



16-17 Female goat-head rhyton, J. Paul Getty Museum 71.AE.266

characteristically South Italian, have been modified to suit local taste.¹⁴ Like many early Italiote rhyta, the original mould for the Maltese lapdog was probably taken from its matrix about the mid-fourth century B.C. But the Newark rhyton, pressed from an oft-used form, is a later piece. The painting, a female head in profile with a floral design and stick pattern at the rim, is attributable to the Rhyton Group, connected with the Stoke-on-Trent Painter. The piece may be dated to the end of the third quarter of the century, ca. 330 B.C., when this type of representation was extremely popular.

A griffin-head rhyton, the name piece of the Seattle-Group, is also connected with the Stoke-on-Trent Painter (see Figs. 20-22).¹⁵ The decoration, showing a Nike-head in profile with sticks at the rim and ivy leaves toward the top, is stylistically related to the only other extant Griffin-head from this series. This resemblance is not surprising as the painter of the other, known as the Painter of the Lecce horse-head, has also been connected with the Stoke-on-Trent Painter.¹⁶ Although both pieces were made near the beginning of the last quarter of the fourth century, the Seattle-Group rhyton seems to be the later of the two. This order is suggested since its head is evidently from the more eroded mould. In addition, the painting on it is more carelessly executed, as was often the case on the later, poorer impressions from a mould.

Finally, we have an example of Gnathian pottery: a curious horse-head rhyton now in the J. A. Goldwyn Collection in San Francisco (see Fig. 23).¹⁷ To date, only three such rhyta have been published,¹⁸ and all are bull-heads from the early years of the Gnathian production, ca. 330 B.C. Plastically and graphically the bulls resemble contemporary red-figure Apulian ware, differing only in their coloring. But the horse-head departs radically from the Apulian rhyton tradition in that it is merely a stylized image of a horse, not an immediately recognizable plastic form.¹⁹ Its small size, due to generations of shrinkage, suggests that it is a late piece. The black ground of the rhyton is decorated with a simple white egg pattern over a band of dots about the rim and

14) Hoffmann, 45. Plate XXVI, 2.

15) Seattle Art Museum, no. 67.Cs20.60; intact (its left ear may be modern). Main group, series H. Photographs courtesy of Seattle Art Museum. Attribution by A. D. Trendall.

16) See Hoffmann, Plate XLVI, 1, 2.

17) Known to me only from photographs in the J. Paul Getty Museum archives.

18) Hoffmann, 87.

19) The horse was an extremely popular type of rhyton in Apulia. It was represented repeatedly, not only in terracotta, but also in silver, gold and bronze. Some of the finest Apulian animal sculpture is of horses and horse-heads. See my note 1 and also B. Svoboda and D. Cončev, *Neue Denkmäler antiker Toreutik*, Prague, 1956.

a scattering of flowers and vines on the main part of the bowl. Unlike earlier, stylistically ambitious and iconographically meaningful Gnathian decoration, the painting here is purely ornamental, further emphasizing that a late dating, ca. 300 B.C., is in order. This horse-head while it represents the nadir of the Italiote rhyton production, provides us, nonetheless, with evidence that plastic vases were still being created in Southern Italy, even after rhyta in the Attic red-figure tradition were no longer in fashion.

APPENDIX

After this paper went to press, two more rhyta appeared on the New York art market (see catalogue, Sotheby Parke Bernet, *Antiquities and Islamic Works of Art Glass from the Ray Winfield Smith Collection*, New York, May 2, 1975, nos. 120 and 123, for photographs). The first of these, a Maltese lapdog, 16.7 cm. in length, is apparently intact. Its bowl is decorated with the same subject (a female head in profile) as is the Newark Museum rhyton discussed above. Like that piece, the new dog-head seems to be attributable to the Rhyton Group, connected with the Stoke-on-Trent Painter. However, the mould from which the new piece was pressed was more worn than it had been for the Newark rhyton. Thus, the new Maltese lapdog may be of a slightly later date, possibly about 325 B.C.

The other rhyton represents a Laconian hound head. It is 19.7 cm. long and has several breaks in it which have been glued together. Although the bowl was clearly pulled and painted about 340 B.C., the head might well be a more recent addition. This is suggested by its uncharacteristic modelling and by the unusual handling of the incised details at mouth and eyes. Furthermore, a crack, running like a collar between bowl and head, lends additional support to the proposal that the piece is only partially ancient.

Selma Holo
Art Center College of Design, Los Angeles



18-19 Dog-head rhyton, Newark Museum 69.166



20-22 Griffin-head rhyton, Seattle Art Museum 67.Cs20.60



23 Horse-head rhyton, private collection, San Francisco

Amongst the exceptionally rich treasures revealed to one who had the exciting good fortune to visit the J. Paul Getty Museum on its first day of opening to the public, a small but real surprise and delight for the connoisseur was the cup illustrated (Figs. 1, 2), lent by Mr. Hans Cohn. Made and painted in Athens during the remarkable first flowering of Greek art, the so-called Geometric period which attained its climax in the mid 8th century B.C., it has figure work of unusual interest.¹

The cup, 5.7 cm. high and 14 cm. in diameter across the rim, is now conventionally called a skyphos, to denote the shape which developed in Late Geometric c. 735 B.C., and of which this piece is typical: a rather shallow bowl with flat base, sides gently curving out at an angle of about 45°, with separate offset flaring lip and thin rolled horizontal handles.²

Although the iconography of the interior claims our attention, the general scheme and manner of decoration need first to be described. On the exterior, quite fine decoration in glaze which has fired brown; under the base, four concentric circles with central dot; then from the bottom up four types of abstract ornament (separated by the usual groups of lines), cross-hatched pendant triangles with a dot between the apices, rather careless checkerboard, multi-tiered uneven zigzags stopped by vertical frames at the handles, vertical stripes under the lip; at each handle base a degenerate star above dots, dots along each handle with stripes above and below. On the flattened rim, a careful dotted lozenge chain, on the interior (which has fired reddish) below the figure zone three and a half circles of checker, in the middle linked dotted circles around a star and surrounded by a 'fringed' circle. The main interior zone appears somewhat more coarse and heavy-handed in both its figure painting and its subsidiary decoration, but the artist has displayed care for ordered disposition and exact repetition. Four horses, each 'driven' by a rider perched on

the rump with the reins in one hand as though riding bareback, alternate with four warriors, each distinguished by a helmet with a fringed crest, a so-called Dipylon shield and a pair of spears. For filling ornament, below each horse's belly a diamond quartered and dotted, above each back stars and stacked double chevrons, which are also used, along with upright and pendant triangles, to isolate the figures carefully.³ Some other odd decoration, especially wavy lines in the cut-out scallops of each shield.

Our figure painter was certainly not a master with a penchant for naturalism. Amongst all the troops of Geometric horses, there are not many with such disjointed and ill-proportioned anatomies, massive shoulders, emaciated bodies, baggy hind-quarters and match-stick legs. Infrequently does the Geometric artist allow such thoughtless lack of connection between the ends of his warriors' spears, though he normally gives no evidence of a body behind the shield. Yet, for all his stylization, he is evidently quite painstaking, not at all sloppy.

In terms of the now accepted analysis of Geometric painting by Coldstream the skyphos should be assigned to the phase designated LG 11a, perhaps c. 725 B.C. It might be wise to be cautious about attribution to any particular one of Coldstream's painters or workshops. The main criteria for attribution are the figure work, particularly of the horses; the shape of the shield, tending to elongated arcs; the repertoire of subsidiary decoration; and the shape of the cup itself. On the first two of these there would appear to be links with his Sub-Dipylon Group, but also definite similarities with the products of the Birdseed Workshop. On the other hand, it is probable in the present state of our knowledge that such figured skyphoi were popularized or even initiated by the Birdseed Painter (Coldstream, 68).⁴ On balance I should relate the Cohn skyphos to the Birdseed Painter.

1) L 73.AE.26, broken but restored with no significant loss. I sincerely thank Dr. J. Frel for so generously indulging my interest on that hectic day and to Mr. Hans Cohn for granting me permission to publish the vase. The following abbreviations are used for the major accounts of Geometric art: Coldstream = J. N. Coldstream, *Greek Geometric Pottery* (1968); Davison = J. M. Davison, *Attic Geometric Workshops* (Yale Classical Studies XVI, 1961); Schweitzer = B. Schweitzer, *Greek Geometric Art* (Eng. trans. 1971); and for the major systematic publications of material, *Agora VIII* = E. Brann, *Late Geometric and Protoattic Pottery* (Athenian Agora VIII, 1962); *Ker. V* = K. Kübler, *Kerameikos, Ergebnisse der Ausgrabungen*, V (1954). An important discussion which is referred to by the author's name is John Carter, "The Beginning of Narrative Art in the Greek Geometric Period," *BSA* 67 (1972), 25-58. I should say here how valuable I find his discussion, since in this article I have occasion to disagree with his views. 2) This shape began essentially in the period designated LG 11a (Coldstream, 86-7) and survived until the end of Geometric. The develop-

ment of the shape can be followed in *Ker V*, taf. 89ff, esp. 128ff, *Agora VIII*, pl. 8. The bowl is called 'deep' by *Ker V* and Schweitzer, rather misleadingly since any interior figure scene, which constitutes the main interest of these cups, needed to be seen clearly in its entirety. A good test today is whether the interior can be photographed from above without serious distortion.

3) One may guess that the artist started with the horse which occupies one whole handle area and proceeded clockwise, leaving insufficient space for double chevrons when he came full circle.

4) The Sub-Dipylon Group, within the Classical tradition: Coldstream, 55-6; e.g. Davison, figs. 94-101, 111, esp. 94-7. (Also cf. Coldstream, pl. 12c, which he refers to the style of the Sub-Dipylon Group, p. 67). The Birdseed Workshop, outside the Classical tradition: Coldstream, 67-70; Davison, figs. 72-83, esp. 77 as well as fig. 102 (which Coldstream transfers from her Sub-Dipylon Group to his Birdseed Workshop) and Schweitzer, fig. 16. Coldstream (52 n.1) disbanded Davison's delightfully named Knickerbocker Workshop, suggesting that the

To come now to the subject-matter, one should first emphasize how restricted the artists of this period were, to anonymous silhouettes, devoid of detail, inorganically composite, and precluded from interaction with one another by the necessity for serial juxtaposition of figures.

Amazingly, this did not prevent them from attempting to depict more adventurous scenes, including scenes of action and narrative, which increasingly engaged their attention to the detriment of the meticulous geometric detail. The interpretations of such scenes fall under the broad headings of (1) realistic in intent, whether "secular" or religious/ritualistic, (2) heroic/mythical, including illustrative of epic, and (3) imitative of Oriental art, heroic/mythical, including illustrative of epic, and (4) imitative of Oriental art, that is primarily artistic. Since there is no reason to suppose the artists were always motivated by a single purpose, all may be variously valid, and not even necessarily mutually exclusive.⁵ Certainly at this time other more exotic animals were introduced into the vase-painter's repertoire besides the ubiquitous everyday horses, deer, and birds: some real, like the lion, panther, and bull, others fabulous, such as the sphinx, griffin and centaur, as well as a range of hybrid monsters. A good case can be made out that these were of Eastern inspiration, at least in part.⁶

It is undoubtedly striking how many of these more progressive subjects were painted on only two shapes of vase, the oinochoe (jug) and the interior of the skyphos. Schweitzer (307-8, nn. 66 & 67) has given partial lists of

both these; with the former we are not presently concerned (though they deserve separate treatment as a group), but a closer look at the skyphoi is appropriate here. In the first place it has been argued that the particular skyphos shape has been influenced by metal prototypes, and this may be so, though some transitional forms allow one to follow the development from earlier versions of the cup. Further, Schweitzer and Carter specifically suggest that the precise shape was evolved on the analogy of shallow, almost flat Oriental bronze bowls, which carried circular friezes of animal and human decoration on the interior, and of which examples had been imported into Greece by this time. Schweitzer may well have a point in expressing surprise at finding figure decoration on the interior of the Geometric skyphos, which he terms a 'completely non-Geometric technique', a point which if valid would support the argument for deliberate imitation of these Eastern bowls (Schweitzer, 52).⁷

Secondly, it is remarkable how many of the stranger beasts among the extended menagerie mentioned above were experimented with on these skyphoi, either with or without human figures as well. Although some have only the ordinary animals, they include the first representations in Greek vase-painting of bull and panther, and among the very first lions and (probably) sphinxes.⁸ As stated already, these seem mainly to derive from Eastern artistic representations.

It is however those skyphoi which include human figures which are of immediate relevance to us here.

animals of the group showed independent derivation from the Dipylon Master's Workshop rather than distinct family likeness: her description (Davison, 64) of the animals as "most peculiarly drawn, with the masses of chest, hindquarters, and thighs heavily filled in, while the lower legs are attached like bones protruding from bloused knickers" well describes our horses. The skyphoi of the Birdseed Workshop are Coldstream, 67-8, nos. 7, 20-28. The other main group, perhaps inspired by these, are produced in the Workshop of Athens 894, Coldstream, 68, 60 nos. 45-8. For what it is worth, noticeable absentees from the decorative scheme of our cup are the reserved eye, the bird file and the double axe design (cf. below) as well as the meander and swastika. 5) A fairly complete list of Geometric figure scenes was given by T. Tölle, *Frühgriechische Reigentänze* (1964). Important recent discussions of possible mythical and heroic subjects are in T.B.L. Webster, *BSA* 50 (1955) 38-50, H. von Steuben, *Frühe Sagen Darstellungen in Korinth und Athen* (1968) and K. Fittschen, *Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagen Darstellungen bei den Griechen* (1969). See also now J. Carter, *BSA* 67 (1972) 25-58, defending Oriental influence, as does Schweitzer, 52-6. Cf. G. Ahlberg, *Fighting on Land and Sea in Greek Geometric Art* (1971).

6) The lion seems unlikely to have been known at least in southern mainland Greece in historical times. For the Oriental origin of these animals, see Carter, 42ff, Schweitzer, 52ff.

7) Oriental metal prototypes and their discovery in Greece: Kunze, *Kretische Bronzereliefs*, 76 n.6; Schweitzer, 52; Carter, 46-7 (in nn. 95, 124, 125, 126, 130 he lists 8 so far found in Greece); cf. Brann,

Hesperia, 30(1961) 122; *Agora VIII*, on Cat. no. 146. One wonders, however, whether the shallow plate with ribbon handles would not have borne a closer resemblance to the Oriental bowl.

8) In Schweitzer's list of skyphoi with animal subjects (308, n.67), his nos. 1, 2, 3 and 4 have only ordinary bird friezes on the interior and exterior (Coldstream, 68, Birdseed Workshop, nos. 20, 21, 22, 23). Similarly, the three skyphoi under his nos. 5 and 7 have only deer and horses respectively. The more significant skyphoi with animals alone are four in number: Kerameikos 1319, with friezes of deer and gazelles on the interior and exterior, and a single bull on the exterior: Schweitzer, no. 6; *Ker V*, taf. 130; Coldstream, 52 n. 1, 88 n. 2, LG 11a — Würzburg, with four lions on the interior: Schweitzer, no. 8; Coldstream, 60-47, Workshop of Athens 894, LG 11b. — A new skyphos found in Athens with five lions on the interior: *AD* 23(1968) B', pl. 46; close in style to the Würzburg skyphos. — Edinburgh L 363, with lion, panther and bull on the interior: Schweitzer, no. 9; Coldstream, 68.28, Birdseed Workshop but late, near Protoattic; J. M. Cook, *BSA* 35 (1934-5) 191 n. 2 for this as depicting the earliest panther. (Panther is the conventional name for a full-face lion.) — Another Geometric skyphos which should perhaps be mentioned in this connection is one in the Vlastos collection, referred to in *BSA* 34(1933-4) 104, the interior of which has 6 horses facing right, of which one is being attacked by a lion from behind, another has a Dipylon shield over its back. — The other animals are found in the list of human-figured skyphoi: the earliest bull on no. 2 below; lions and bulls on no. 5; and the sphinxes, if such they are, on no. 4.

Excluding a couple of doubtful cases the list of examples known to me, extending by three that given by Schweitzer, is as follows.⁹ The list is only partly chronological and does not aim at bibliographical completeness.

1. Athens, M. M. 874: Schweitzer, no. 10, pl. 66; Davison, fig. 134 (her Burly Workshop). LG IIa. 'Chorus' of 13 women and 7 men, three of whom hold lyres (?). Tripods on exterior.
2. Athens, N. M. 13038: Schweitzer, no. 11, fig. 16; Coldstream, 67.7, Birdseed Painter. LG IIa. Dipylon warrior between two horses; bull; male; two horse-riders.
3. Malibu, J. Paul Getty Museum (Cohn). LG IIa.
4. Athens, N. M. 784: Schweitzer, no. 12, pl. 65; Coldstream, 60.48, Workshop of Athens 894. LG IIb. Four females approach seated figure; kneeling figure on dais between two Dipylon warriors; antithetical sphinxes (?).
5. Athens, N. M. 14475: Schweitzer, no. 13, pl. 70; Kunze, *Kretische Bronzereliefs*, taf. 53e. LG IIb. Small figure standing between jaws of two lions; 4 bulls.
6. London, B. M. 1950. 11-19.1: Davison, fig. 83; Coldstream, 68.24, Birdseed Workshop. LG IIa-b. 13 seated figures.
7. Athens, N. M. 729: Hahland, *Festschrift Zucker*, no. 9, abb. 16; Davison, p. 61-2 (her Birdseed Painter Workshop) LG IIb. 12 seated figures holding 'rattles'.
8. Munich 6029: Schweitzer, no. 14; CVA Mun. 3, taf. 124.3-4, LG IIb. 13 warriors with square or round shields, linked hands.

No proper discussion of these, such as they merit, can be attempted here, but a few comments are called for. Some indeed have only a repetitive series of figures without apparent special significance. But even amongst these nos. 6 and 7 fall into a special — and baffling — category, along with a number of other vases, the significance of whose representations is most debatable;

suffice it to say there is a case for arguing both that they depict some actual ritual, probably funerary and perhaps specifically musical, and that they may be inspired by Oriental prototypes.¹⁰ Nos. 1 and 8 seem too to have some broadly ceremonial and choral reference, to judge from the linked hands on both and the presumed lyres on the former; the tripods most likely represent prizes given in contests.¹¹ Most difficult to interpret are nos. 2, 4 and 5. On no. 4 females with linked hands approach a seated figure (now largely lost) whom some have thought the first clear representation of divinity, probably female, in Greek vase-painting; the kneeling figure may plausibly be a dancer or harp player, while the proto-sphinxes may be the first attempt to translate these creatures into Greek idiom (Carter 48-9). Coherent interpretation of the whole scene seems at best hazardous, and indeed Carter believes that the artist has been inspired and fascinated by individual Oriental motifs to produce an 'extraordinary farrago', 'a mangled piece of Syrian iconography' (Carter 46-7). This may be so, but one is reluctant to think of an artist at this stage content to paint meaningless scenes, moved by purely 'artistic' considerations. Again, no. 2 seems to present a miscellaneous assortment, but the bull (the first in Greek art, Coldstream 69) may be symbolic of untamed power, while we shall see further below that it has been argued the figure between two antithetical horses represents a heroized warrior or divine figure, the object of cult.

The scene on no. 5 may assist this general interpretation. Although the lions are derived from the East, it is hard to believe that the tiny figure overshadowed by such formidable beasts can represent the royal or divine vanquisher of lions in Eastern art, the Master of Lions.¹² It is surely significant that elsewhere in Geometric vase-painting, in only one instance of human-lion contact is the human victorious, whereas in four other cases he is obviously the victim.¹³ I believe it preferable to regard

9) The exclusions are, at one end of the scale: (1) Halle, Altheim: Bielefeld, *Studies D. M. Robinson*, II, 43f, pl. 10. File of warriors with Dipylon or round shields around inside of lip. Coldstream, 26, calls it a MG 11 forerunner, but with Carter, I think it more likely to be LG 1; at any rate in shape it can hardly be classed with our skyphoi, albeit perhaps transitional to them; and at the other end (2) Athens, Agora P5282: Agora VIII, pl. 19, no. 337, p. 59, Workshop of Athens 894, LG 11b. This would be a 'ring-in', since it is more a saucer than a skyphos, and the artist seems to have doodled, converting the central tondo into a round shield for a barely suggested warrior. It is, however, interesting as the earliest tondo in Greek art (cf. *Ker V*, taf. 37, no. 1168, another LG tondo of a warrior?)


10) Discussions in J. M. Cook, *BCH* 70(1946) 97-101, W. Hahland, *Festschrift Zucker* (1954) 77ff, G. Ahlberg, *Opuscula Atheniensia* 7 (1967) 177-86; cf. Coldstream, 71-2, J. Boardman, *JHS* 86(1966) 4-5.

11) The suggested interpretation of no. 1 by Schweitzer 53 is surely too speculative.

12) The 'lion-tamer', as Schweitzer, 54-5, calls him. There is no doubt

that the lion-grappling motif is Oriental, as Schweitzer and Carter, 43 and 45, nn. 110-12, clearly exemplify.

13) On the famous four-legged Kerameikos Stand 407, *Ker V*, taf. 69, the 'hero' is plunging the sword into the jaws of the lion, to which he is fully the equal in stature; admittedly this is repeated on two other legs, and in the fourth a man is carrying an animal (a dead lion?) in his arms, but on this same leg a lion is clearly devouring a human. The other examples of man-eating lions are on *Ker V*, taf. 77, no. 2160, man collapsing before pursuing lion; kantharos Copenhagen 727, Davison, fig. 128, Schweitzer pl. 69, where again two lions are obviously mauling a human; and a number of instances of two lions attacking a man whose head is already in the mouth of one, on a group of Attic gold bands, Ohly, *Griechische Goldbleche* (1953), nos. A 7-14. I agree with Ohly's opinion as quoted by Schweitzer 55, as against Carter 41-2 and n. 93, that these gold bands had a funerary purpose. It follows that given this context, I am reluctant to regard any scene as representing Herakles defeating the Nemean lion, although they could soon suggest it.



1-2 Geometric cup on loan in the J. Paul Getty Museum
from the collection of Hans Cohn, L73.AE.26



3 Leg of a tripod, Olympia B1665

the lion as in the first instance, the symbol of natural ferocity and untamed, destructive power, and thence to have been taken by the Greeks as a more specific symbol of ravaging death. The vases would in that case have reference to funereal ritual and cult, including associated performances of dances and games.¹⁴ Further, the sphinxes and bulls may also quite possibly have been used by the Greek artists to express the same idea; that is, they too, like the lions, might be regarded as elemental powers, and 'allegorical representations' of rapacious spirits which carried men off to their death.¹⁵ At the same time, one can already sense the innate Greek tendency to translate these Eastern heraldic symbols into dramatic narrative images.

This brief survey has, I hope, at least sketched a *prima facie* case for taking these skyphoi seriously, and perhaps with particular reference to funerary ritual. However much the artist may be indebted to Eastern art, I believe he is not just toying with the Eastern motifs, producing meaningless jumbles, but using them in his struggle to realize visually ideas he can hardly yet coherently express.

Now that we can see our new skyphos in its context, let us return to it. Taken by themselves there is nothing unusual in the individual motifs of human figure, horse and warrior, nothing which appears so far fetched as on some of the other skyphoi. But still, the figures perched on the backs of the horses are peculiar, and hardly realistic. Much as it may be disappointing to admit it, I doubt that such circus-type riders are known in Greece; and by this time the artist would have had no difficulty in painting an actual horse-rider if that had been his intention.¹⁶

The figure is not quite unique in Geometric art. There is one other instance, not in vase-painting but as a small relief-work panel on a leg of a bronze tripod found in Olympia, presumably made for dedication there roughly contemporaneously with our skyphos (fig. 3).¹⁷ By a remarkable coincidence (not unprecedented in archaeological studies) Carter on pp. 49-50 of his recent article adduced this very tripod-leg design and commented on its effective uniqueness — as it then seemed — in Greek art. This he explained by reasonably deriving it from the copious Oriental, especially Assyrian, prototypes of the heraldic figure of a god or goddess standing trium-

phantly on the back of a bull or lion; and argued that the paucity of its abortive appearances in Greek art was due to its failure to find a corresponding figure in myth or legend who could domesticate the motif and fill it with significant and convincing narrative content. Presumably he would believe that its original borrowing was another case of meaningless, 'artistic' imitation.

We may now be able to revise this interpretation in the light of the Cohn skyphos. It certainly helps to confirm the Eastern source of some Late Geometric iconography, particularly on the skyphoi. We now however have two clear examples of the motif in Geometric art. Admittedly, two swallows hardly make a summer any more than one does; and quite possibly the motif still failed to prove fertile in later art because there was no Greek legend it could 'illustrate'. On the other hand, even if the appearance of the motif on an object so important as a tripod dedication could be regarded as decorative, without serious meaningful content — which seems improbable — the new skyphos makes this less likely. What then could the artist have intended? Two points are worth considering.

In the first place, it now becomes clearer that the motif has been 'translated' into Greek with the substitution of a horse for the Oriental bull or lion. Since on the skyphos the painter also gives the rider reins, the reason for this change could be to make the action that much more plausible. But also, in view of the suggestion offered above, that the lion and bull are regarded in Geometric art as symbols of death, we may also think the substitution was made here to avoid that interpretation, or at least of the implacable destructiveness of death which the lion or bull might imply.

Secondly, the skyphos presents us not with horse and rider alone, but in conjunction with the Dipylon shield warrior. This at least reminds us of the notorious controversy over this strange shield form in Geometric art. There are those who have argued that it is not a realistic depiction of contemporary armour but rather a 'stage property' symbolizing heroic or divine status, perhaps due to reminiscence or actual survival of an antique Mycenaean shield.¹⁸ In view of the weighty considerations which can be advanced against this, it is unwise to accept it, at any rate by itself. However, we are in turn

14) As on the Copenhagen kantharos mentioned in the last note. There is therefore no need to see on that vase the lion-devouring scene as 'incongruous' with the scene of performances in honour of the dead, as Carter 44 does.

15) See Schweitzer 55, for this interpretation of lions and sphinxes, quoting and supporting Ohly.

16) Horseriders earlier than the date of our cup are certainly on the famous krater B.M. 1899. 2-19.1 (Coldstream 55.4, 56: 'the first cavalier'; Davison, fig. 98), and probably the skyphos no. 2 above. Up to

ten other examples by the end of the 8th century show how easily even poor artists coped with this.

17) Olympia B 1665: Willemsen, *Olympische Forschungen* III (1957) pl. 46. I am indebted to the German Archaeological Institute, Athens, for the photograph and permission to publish it.

18) A major protagonist for this interpretation is T.B.L. Webster, *BSA* 50(1955) 41ff., following particularly Hampe. The opposing case for realistic representation is, it must be admitted, strongly argued by Ahlberg, *Fighting on Land and Sea in Greek Geometric Art* (1971)

reminded of the possible significance of the horse in Geometric funerary art by its frequent association with such a Dipylon warrior.

The overwhelming popularity of the horse in Geometric art needs no demonstration: it appears alone or in company with humans literally hundreds of times. Often it fulfills a quite utilitarian function, as in drawing a chariot; at other times it may be simply a realistic emblem of aristocratic property. But it has also been suggested that the horse can carry funerary symbolism, a proposal which can find some support.¹⁹ Among the most striking representations are many of a male, often equipped with Dipylon shield, holding by the reins or muzzle a horse or frequently two antithetical horses one on either side of him, and these have been held to be depictions of a hero or god, the divine figure of the tamer or master of horses, known from cult.²⁰ My suggestion is that the combination of factors makes it likely the painter of the Cohn skyphos intended to represent some such heroic or divine figure connected with cult, perhaps particularly cult of the dead.²¹ He could be specifically Poseidon, since this god was connected both with the horse under the title Hippios and with cult of the dead. It would be an attractive conjecture that if Poseidon was originally conceived in equine form, this could be the Geometric artist's attempt to produce a convincing image. The Geometric artist's love of repetition means that the four-fold appearance of the figure need not preclude such an interpretation; but it is as likely that the painter intended a more general reference, adapting an Oriental motif in order to present as convincing a visualization as possible of divine power and status conceived as mastery of horses.²²

Ronald G. Hood
John Elliott Classics Museum
University of Tasmania

59-66, and Carter 54-8.

19) Malten, *Jdl* 29(1914) 179ff; Schweitzer, 54. Compare a number of examples of horses tied to tripods, which may also have funerary significance.

20) Cf. Webster, 42-3, Schweitzer, 54. Almost random examples of the group in Attic art are Ker. 1306, *Ker* V, taf. 110 and 141, Schweitzer, pl. 29; *Ker* V, taf. 87, no. 268; Athens N.M. 13038, no. 2 above; Berlin VI 3374, Schweitzer pl. 56; Cambridge GR-1-1935, Coldstream pl. 13, e-f; NY 10.210.7, Davison fig. 51; Copenhagen 1628, Davison, fig. 133. Compare the earliest actual horse-taming representation of all, on the outside of a mug, Ker. 2159, *Ker* V, taf. 111 and 141, which shows one warrior facing a horse and holding its reins, another standing behind it with a whip. Perhaps the only other similar scene is on the neck-amphora Munich 6183, CVA, Munich 3, taf. 108.1-2, Schweitzer, *Herakles* 93, abb. 25, which shows on each side of the neck a man standing behind a prancing horse and holding the reins. Schweitzer interprets this figure as the semi-divine ἵππων δμητήρ, but the painting is so carelessly incompetent one is reluctant to accept such a serious

religious interpretation.

21) Schweitzer, 54, considers that either a bird or the double-axe design is a 'determinative', that is, symbolic of the epiphany of such a divine figure. This I think unlikely; at any rate it is interesting that neither appears amongst the decoration of our skyphos.

22) There are also, of course, a multitude of similar representations of antithetical horses and horse-tamings in other local styles of Geometric, above all in the 'horsey' area of Argos. The most interesting scene for present purposes is on the krater fragment C.240, Courbin, *Céramique géométrique de l'Argolide*, pl. 40, which Coldstream, 129, states is the earliest Argive figured scene at the very beginning of LG 1. It shows in a panel, below a 'chorus', a male (wearing an enormous helmet or head-dress) holding the reins of a horse from behind. He is shown as almost standing on the horse's back, but I suspect this is only because of the squarish shape of the panel. Coldstream interprets the picture as of a horse-tamer, but no doubt in a realistic sense; Courbin, 492, certainly takes it as having religious or ceremonial significance, partly because of the presence of the file of men and women.

Primitive Rock Engravings from Crete

In making the following suggestions about some primitive rock engravings from Crete, I am sensible that they scarcely qualify for the name of art. At the same time, if I am right about their true date, they open a vista upon the kind of life which the Dorian Greeks were living and their stage of artistic development when they first settled in the Aegean world, before they began to be deeply affected by contacts with descendants of the old Bronze Age population or to come under influences from Egypt and the Near East. Since Crete was one of the earliest centres of the revival of the arts in Greece, these engravings have a more than usual interest, and as a curiosity at least may prove not unworthy of the notice of the most discriminating and judicious of authorities on Classical Greek art.

The engravings in question are on the floor of the cave of Skordollákia (Askordolákia, Skordolákka or Skordoulákia) near the hamlet of Asfendhou which lies to the east of the White Mountains in the province of Sfakia in western Crete. They were shown to the architect, Christos Papoutsakis, in the summer of 1957, and have been admirably published and described by him (Fig. 3).¹ Independent accounts of the engravings have been given by Paul Faure with valuable comments.² Faure's drawings of them (Fig. 4) differ to some extent from those of Papoutsakis (Fig. 3). But Papoutsakis made casts of the engravings, and his drawings appear to be very faithful copies of them, as I was able to verify by a visit to the cave in April, 1974.

The cave (Fig. 1) lies about ten minutes to the south-east of Asfendhou. The mouth of it, which faces south, is some eight metres above a small patch of cultivable ground where little fields have been made by clearing away the stones. The stones have been piled around the edges of the fields where the rock begins to outcrop, and some of these stone piles are visible just below the cave in Figure 1. The cave looks towards the entrance of an impressive gorge with a mule-track running down it from Asfendhou to the villages in the plain of Frangokastelli and the sea.

The cave is small, only some 8.50 m. long and 3.50 m. wide, with a maximum height of 2.50 m. inside (Fig. 2). The engravings are on an upward slope in the bare rock floor of the cave towards the back. The ceiling of the cave is only between 0.50 and 0.60 m. high above the

slope of rock with the engravings, and it would have been necessary to lie down to make them. They occupy a comparatively small space, about 1.15 m. in length with a greatest width of nearly 0.80 m. A hole (Fig. 3, A) which cuts into the area of the engravings appears to have been made by later treasure seekers, and various graffiti including names (omitted in Figs. 3 and 4) have been carved in the rock in recent times. The equal-armed cross above the hole (A) in Figure 3 belongs with one of these modern inscriptions and is not ancient.

The original engravings mostly consist of animals, weapons, and abstract designs, and large numbers of little hollows or miniature "cup-marks" are intermingled with them (Figs. 5, 6). It seems reasonable to infer that they were made by a group or groups of hunters invoking magical or divine aid in the chase. The region of Asfendhou is said to be still renowned for its hunting throughout the province of Sfakia. The engravings were evidently made over a period of time, since some of them overlap and must be later than others. But the period of time involved was not necessarily a long one.

Most of the animals are clearly long-horned wild goats (*agrimia*) of the kind which still live in the White Mountains of western Crete. But there are also what may be meant for pairs of deer antlers, although heads and bodies to go with these seem lacking.³ All the goats are engraved in outline, usually with a dot for the eye, a pair of horns, and four stick-like legs. Their feet are normally indicated by little round hollows or dashes.

At the top of the engraved area can be seen what Papoutsakis has interpreted as two ships, crescent-shaped with raised prows and sterns (Fig. 7). Only one of these, however, is clearly defined, and Faure has argued that it is really a trap or net with a deer caught in it.⁴ But it looks very much like a ship with a mast and stays indicated, while the deer is more lightly engraved and may have been cut earlier or later. The second ship appears to be similar to the one above it.

Weapons include at least one if not two examples of bows with arrows in them. The ends of the most clearly engraved of these bows are upturned, and both Faure and Papoutsakis have inferred that it must be meant for a composite bow (Figs. 5, top right, and 8). Bows of this type (with additions of horn or other material to strength-

I am exceedingly grateful to Mr. Christos Papoutsakis, the discoverer of the cave at Asfendhou, for the generous way in which he has provided me with information about it along with references to comparative material, as well as letting me reproduce many of his excellent drawings. Professor Paul Faure has kindly permitted me to reproduce his drawing of the engravings in Figure 4. The photographs of the engravings are by Mr. Antonis Zois, and I am very much indebted to him for allowing me to use them. The tracings on Figures 2, 9 and 12,

were made for me by Mrs. Patricia Clarke.

1) Ch. G. Papoutsakis, *Kritika Chronika* 1972, 107-39. Cf. A. Zois, *Epetiris Epistimonikon Erevnon Panepistimiou Athinon* iii (1972) 456 f., and *BCH* xcvi (1973) 23-30.

2) P. Faure, *Amaltheia* 1971, 277-83, and *BCH* xcvi (1972) 406-13; xcvi (1973) 29-30.


3) But see P. Faure, *BCH* xcvi (1972) 410.

4) *Amaltheia* 1971, 282. *BCH* xcvi (1972) 410.



1 The cave at Asfendhou

2 The cave (cross-section from above)



EXPOSED ROCK



ENGRAVINGS

3 Rock engravings from Asfendhou, Papoutsakis' interpretation



4 Rock drawings from Asfendhou, Faure's interpretation



en them) were known in Crete during the Iron Age, but are already attested in the Bronze Age there.⁵

As well as the bows with arrows there are a good many objects which appear to be missiles with feathered ends (Fig. 5, bottom left). These could be arrows, but in view of their large size in comparison with the bows they may be meant for javelins. The blades are wide and look metallic, with lines through them suggestive of mid-ribs. Most, if not all, are leaf-shaped as seen in Figure 5, although one or two according to Faure's drawings are more triangular and somewhat concave at the base (Fig. 9). The feathered ends hardly differ from the blades in shape, and Papoutsakis has suggested that the objects might be intended for double paddles rather than weapons. But the way in which the shafts are regularly cut as if projecting beyond one of the leaf-shaped ends supports the view of Faure that they are fletched arrows or javelins.

Some of these feathered ends with projecting shafts have a line at right angles through them so that they resemble crossed circles (Fig. 9, centre). In addition Faure claims to have identified a free-standing circle with a cross in it. A larger, boldly engraved circle at the bottom of the complex is crossed by three instead of two lines (Fig. 6, left). Faure interprets these crossed circles as pit-falls for animals covered with branches to conceal them. But crossed circles of a similar kind often appear to stand as symbols for the sun, as we shall see.

Other abstract designs, if they can qualify for the name, include an M-shaped zig-zag (Fig. 10, top left). In addition, the whole area covered by the engravings is spattered with little hollows, or miniature "cup-marks", between one and five millimetres in diameter. The hollows are disposed singly, or arranged in groups, which sometimes appear to form shapes, including what may be meant for spirals, a double axe, and an animal.⁶ Faure considers the groups of hollows to be the signatures of some seventy different hunters, but other interpretations are clearly possible.

Both Faure and Papoutsakis believe that the engravings were made with stone tools, not metal ones; in that case probably with points of a local chert which is black and said to be of the same consistency and degree of hardness as obsidian.⁷ Some of the deeper cuttings, notably the

lines for the most clearly engraved of the two ships, are V-shaped.

The date of these curious engravings has already been the subject of much speculation. Pottery has been recovered from the area in front of the cave.⁸ This seems to include a good deal of Early Minoan together with examples of later Bronze Age wares. But there is also some Roman, and I noted a scatter of Greco-Roman sherds over the rocky ground between the cave and Asfendhou. A vaulted cistern at Pigadholakkos just to the west of the cave by the path from Asfendhou to the head of the gorge may also date from the Roman period. The area has evidently attracted occupation, even if only seasonal, throughout the ages. Pottery from the neighbourhood of the cave, that is to say, does not necessarily have a connection with the engravings. In the last resort comparisons for the engravings themselves are probably the safest guide to their date.

Primitive rock engravings of this kind may give a deceptive impression of being much earlier than they in fact are. Thus various groups of rock carvings in different parts of Turkey and further east, once assigned to the Neolithic or Hittite Bronze Age, have been shown to be the work of Arab or other invaders in the Middle Ages.⁹ A number of them for instance were carved on the walls of a ruined temple of the Roman period at Aizanoi in Phrygia.¹⁰ Some rock engravings at Philippi in Thrace (Fig. 11) may have been made by the Bulgars who took the city in A.D. 837,¹¹ although others appear to be earlier, dating from the first millennium B.C. as we shall see.

Papoutsakis and Zois have assigned the Asfendhou engravings to the Mesolithic period, if not to the latest Palaeolithic. The ships (Fig. 7) in this view are regarded as being among the last of the engravings, which it is suggested were made over a very long stretch of time covering perhaps millennia. But the homogeneous character of the engravings, and the small space which they occupy, make it difficult to believe that they were executed over a vast space of time like this. In any case there are other indications besides the ships to suggest that the engravings must belong to a later age. The arrows or javelins for instance appear to have wide metal heads with marked mid-ribs (Figs. 5, 9).

5) A. M. Snodgrass, *Early Greek Armour and Weapons* (Edinburgh, 1964) 141 ff. S. Piggott, "Beaker Bows: A Suggestion," *Proceedings of the Prehistoric Society* xxxvii Part ii (1971) 80-94. But see J.G.D. Clarke, *ibid.* xxix (1963), 52, in reference to pl. ix, lower.

6) P. Faure, *Amaltheia* 1971, 283. *BCH* xcvi (1972) 410, 412.

7) *BCH* xcvi (1972) 409. *Kritika Chronika* 1972, 118 f.

8) Faure, *BCH* xcvi (1972) 407, 412, noted sherds on the path leading to the cave assignable to Early Minoan-Middle Minoan I/II. Cf. *BCH* xcvi (1973) 30. Zois, *ibid.* 28 note 11, assigns sherds recovered during

work of consolidation at the cave to various Minoan periods.

9) K. Bittel, "Bemerkungen zu einigen Felsbildern in Mesopotamien und Anatolien," *Belleten* xvii (1953) 314-20. Cf. S. Hass and I. Grüniger, "Felsgravierungen in Südöstanatolien," *Antike Welt* ii (1971) Part 2, 26-30.

10) Bittel, *op. cit.* 316 f., fig. 1.

11) *BCH* lxii (1938) 19 fig. 11. Cf. M. V. Garašanin, *Germania* xlvi (1968) 218, for references to other Medieval rock engravings in the Balkans.

Faure would therefore date the engravings at the end of the Cretan Early Bronze Age, or even later, between c. 2000-1500 B.C. But this is to assign them to the flourishing period of the Minoan civilization in Crete, and as Papoutsakis and Zois have correctly stressed, nothing of this kind is known to us from that time. Indeed the engravings and the primitive attitudes which they imply are quite out of keeping with the atmosphere of the Minoan Bronze Age civilization, or even of the Neolithic which preceded it in the island. There is no time, that is to say, during the course of the Neolithic and Bronze Ages of Crete when engravings of this primitive type might be expected there.

After the end of the Bronze Age, however, with the final breakdown of the old Minoan civilization and the settlement of western Crete by Dorian Greeks, it is just possible to imagine a reversion to a state of society where such engravings would be in their element. This is not the place to consider the controversial problem of the Dorian invasions. But there is a good deal of evidence for massive settlement of the mountainous parts of western Crete by Greeks speaking the Dorian dialect during the early Iron Age. The whole area west of the White Mountains is studded with the remains of their cities assignable to the Archaic and Classical periods, while traces of Bronze Age occupation in the region are sparse or non-existent.

The engravings and cup-marks in the cave of Asfendhou are not entirely without parallels in Crete, and the Cretan parallels, such as they are, suggest a date in the Iron Age rather than earlier. In western Crete itself I. Makrikakis long ago noted cup-marks on a rock at Dhrakona and on a stone found at Meskla, both villages located on the northern side of the White Mountains.¹² No cup-marks were visible on the rock in question at Dhrakona when I visited it in the spring of 1974. But the Meskla stone, of which Makrikakis published a photo showing some of the cup-marks, was evidently a large rectangular squared block and in his opinion had formed part of a Greek temple on the site of the later basilica church.

Papoutsakis has remarked that wild goats similar to those of the Asfendhou cave were engraved on a slab of stone from the site of the Greek city of Dreros in eastern Crete.¹³ The slab (Fig. 12) was found outside the temple from which the famous early bronze hammered statues came. It was published by Marinatos, who recognized the resemblance between the engravings on it and Palaeolithic cave paintings of western Europe. But, as he emphasized, the slab had probably once formed part of

the Greek temple. It might have been a step belonging to the crepidoma, since the engravings occupy one of its sides as well as one broad surface. From their position it seems clear that the engravings were made after the stone had been incorporated in the temple and not earlier.

The slab, broken at one end, is 0.36 m. long by 0.26 m. wide and 0.11 m. thick. It shows five goats of various sizes with four unarmed figures in human shape behind them, while a single figure armed with a bow faces them. A smaller fragment with similar engravings (two archers and four goats) was recovered in 1936 and may have been part of the same slab, although it does not join it.¹⁴

It is hardly possible to speak of style in connection with such naive work. But within the category of a primitive art of this kind there are in fact many different ways of doing things. It is therefore striking that the Dreros goats and those from Asfendhou closely resemble each other in a number of specific features: the long horns depicted without the series of knobs usual in Minoan Bronze Age representations, the unfilled bodies, the single dots for eyes, and the four stick-like legs. But it is not only the goats that offer points of resemblance. The bow with upturned ends at Asfendhou (Fig. 8) reappears in the hands of the long-robed archer at Dreros.

The unarmed figures on the Dreros slab might be shepherds according to Marinatos. This is assuming that the goats are domestic. But the scene is surely more like a hunt of some kind. The unarmed figures could be driving the wild goats towards the archer, although the long robes worn by the archer and by one of the "beaters" seem inappropriate for the activities of the chase.

Marinatos reasonably suggested that children with time idle on their hands might have engraved the scene on this slab. This interpretation, however, becomes unnecessary, if not improbable, in the light of the engravings in the Asfendhou cave. Another slab (Fig. 13) with figures in flat relief, including a Gorgon's head, still primitive in appearance but impeccably Greek, was found built into the steps of the "agora" at Dreros just below the temple to which it may also have originally belonged.¹⁵ The reliefs on this slab were assigned by Demargne and van Effenterre to the sixth century B.C. The engravings of Figure 12 are clearly earlier, and a date at the end of the seventh century was indicated for them by Marinatos.

Another stone from the area of the temple at Dreros was engraved with simple linear designs and a row of Archaic letters (Fig. 14).¹⁶ A stone (Fig. 15) recovered

12) I.P.I. Makrikakis, *I Arkhaia Polis Rizinia—ta nin Meskla* (Khania, 1933) 20 ff., with illustration of the Meskla stone before p. 11. Cf. *Kritika Chronika* 1972, 120 f., 125 f.

13) S. Marinatos, *PAE* 1935, 209, 207 fig. 8. Cf. *BCH* lx (1936) 279 f.

fig. 44.

14) P. Demargne and H. van Effenterre, *BCH* lxi (1937) 14 fig. 8.


15) *BCH* lvii (1933) 299 f. fig. 47; lxi (1937) 13 ff. fig. 7.

16) *BCH* lx (1936) 278 f. fig. 43.


5




6



9



10




7



8



11



cm 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15

12



0 10 cm.

- 5-6 Engravings from Asfendhou
- 7 "Ship" detail (Papoutsakis)
- 8 Detail of bow
- 9 Detail (Faure)
- 10 Some details reproduced in modern drawings
- 11 Rock engravings at Philippi in Thrace
- 12 Engraved stone slab from Dreros

from a neighbouring cistern bears curious sign-like marks, which are not letters, although it has been suggested that they might just conceivably be related in some way to signs of Bronze Age script.¹⁷

The technique of outline engraving was certainly practiced in the Aegean area during the Bronze Age. Some of the earlier of the Mycenae shaft grave stelai were decorated in this way, and a marble slab from Ayia Irini in Kea has a fine helmeted head engraved in outline on it.¹⁸ But in Crete this technique does not appear to have flourished until Hellenic times.

The rocks in the region of the Gulf of Mirabello in eastern Crete are liberally sprinkled with engravings and inscriptions assignable to the Archaic period and later. Hand and foot signs are not uncommon there,¹⁹ and in one case at least contours of feet were carved on the rock floor of a cave like the engravings at Asfendhou.²⁰ Animals and human figures cut in outline also occur in association with some of the inscriptions.²¹ One inscription is accompanied by an eight-spoked wheel, reminiscent of the rayed disk at Asfendhou.²²

Among the more dramatic of these Hellenic rock engravings in the area of the Gulf of Mirabello are some to which van Effenterre has called attention on the top of Mount Oxa overlooking Ayios Nikolaos from the north.²³ These engravings may have been associated with a sanctuary, if they were not made by the garrison of a fort as van Effenterre has suggested. They include a large human figure, about 0.70 m. across, resting on one knee (Fig. 16). It is interesting that this figure is crossed by three rows of cup-marks, reminiscent of the spatter of little hollows on the engravings at Asfendhou. A few metres away down the slope of rock to the north from this figure is a neat circle about 0.22 m. in diameter with ten similar cup-marks divided by a line (Fig. 16A). Possibly, however, these had been engraved for playing some game.²⁴

Crete is not the only part of the Hellenic world where primitive looking rock engravings of early Iron Age date are attested. An interesting collection of such engravings was noted many years ago by Papavasileiou

at Kastri near Potamia in Euboea, a site identified by Philippson with ancient Kyme (Figs. 17, 18).²⁵ Triangular spear or javelin heads at Potamia have mid-ribs like the leaf-shaped blades of the Asfendhou darts. With these at Potamia are various signs, evidently non-alphabetic in character, and comparable in a general way with those on the stone from the cistern at Dreros (Fig. 15).²⁶ Among the Potamia signs is an M-shaped zig-zag reminiscent of one at Asfendhou (Fig. 10, top left). Papavasileiou thought that the Potamia engravings were prehistoric, but there appears to be no evidence for occupation of the Kastri site before the Archaic period.

Some crude signs and engravings were identified by Valmin on blocks of stone from a settlement near Malthi in Messenia. This settlement may have replaced Malthi as the main centre of habitation in the area at the very end of the Bronze or the beginning of the Iron Age.²⁷ The engravings here to judge from their description and the poor illustrations of them were not altogether unlike those at Potamia in Euboea.

Primitive engravings of figures with upraised arms on the wall of a Protogeometric house at Iolkos in Thessaly²⁸ are very different in appearance from those at Asfendhou. They are hollowed out like silhouettes in the same way as the little figures of huntsmen on horseback on a cliff at Tren in Albania which are also assigned to the early part of the Iron Age.²⁹ But in their attitude the Iolkos figures are reminiscent of some on rock engravings at Tsogar in the area of Roussa in western Thrace.³⁰ The Tsogar engravings are associated with cup-marks, and have been tentatively assigned to the Late Bronze Age, the thirteenth or twelfth century B.C. Engravings on rocks in the Camonica valley of northern Italy with which they have been compared appear to be of Bronze Age date.³¹

These rock engravings in northern Greece and Thrace are not very like the ones at Asfendhou, although they may reflect a comparable stage of primitive society and perhaps the same general background of ideas. Closer to the Asfendhou engravings, however, as Papoutsakis has recognized, are some from two sites, Karagouy and

17) H. van Effenterre, *BCH* lxxxv (1961) 552 f. fig. 2.

18) *Hesperia* xxxv (1966) 375 pl. 90, b.

19) Guarducci, *Inscriptiones Creticae* i 265 f. no. 64. Cf. 19 no. 24, and *ibid.* iii 159 ff.

20) P. Faure, *BCH* lxxxvii (1963) 496 f.

21) Guarducci, *op. cit.* i 266 no. 64, 1. H. van Effenterre, *Mélanges Ch. Picard* ii (*RevArch* xxxi-xxxii [1949]) 1044, fig. 14.

22) Guarducci, *op. cit.* i 267, no. 64.

23) H. van Effenterre, "Fortins crétois," *Mélanges Ch. Picard* ii (1949) 1036 ff. Cf. *BCH* lxxix (1955) 547 f.

24) Cf. H. van Effenterre, "Cupules et Naumachie," *BCH* lxxix (1955) 541-48 esp. 547 with reference to this circle of cup-marks.

25) G. A. Papavasileiou, *PAE* 1912, 119 ff. figs. 2-6.

26) L. H. Sackett et al., *BSA* lxi (1967) 75 note 119.

27) *OpAth* i (1953) 41-43 pl. iii; ii (1955) 66-74. Occupation at Malthi itself appears to have continued into Late Helladic III C if not later (V. Desborough, *The Last Mycenaeans and their Successors* (Oxford, 1964) 94).

28) *Ergon* 1960, 58 fig. 69.

29) *Shqiperia Arkeologjike* (Tirane, 1971) pls. 28-9. I am very much indebted to Dr. T. Papadopoulos for this reference.

30) D. Triandafillos, *AAA* vi (1973) 241-55.

31) E. Anati, *Camonica Valley* (London, 1964).

Orzchak, in the Pleven district of Bulgaria.³² These two groups of engravings seem to have occupied relatively small expanses of rock like those at Asfendhou. But human figures, lacking at Asfendhou, are represented here as well as animals. As at Asfendhou the engravings are combined with hollows or cup-marks, isolated or arranged in groups.

The rendering of the animals in these Bulgarian engravings (Fig. 19), allowing for the fact that different species are represented, is remarkably similar to the rendering of the wild goats in the Asfendhou cave and on the slab from Dreros (Fig. 12). There are the same outlined bodies with four stick-like legs, and the bodies are left open between the legs as in the case of several of the Asfendhou goats. Moreover, as Papoutsakis has noted, the legs of the Bulgarian animals end in feet made by small hollows as at Asfendhou. It is probably just a coincidence that some of the Bulgarian figures in human shape (Fig. 20) wear long robes like a couple of those on the Dreros slab (Fig. 12). Mikov dated these Bulgarian engravings to the end of the local Bronze Age.

Rock engravings of a comparable type incorporating animals and cup-marks have been recorded from the area of Mount Pangaios in Greek Macedonia. A group of these on an exposed face of rock at Kolmetse overlooking the plain of Amphipolis near the village of Nea Phili has been published by Papoutsakis and assigned by him to the Late Bronze and early part of the Iron Age.³³ Like those at Asfendhou, the Kolmetse engravings cover a restricted area measuring about 1.00 x 1.20 m. They include a stag, and bows strung with arrows reminiscent of Asfendhou. But a plough and an armed horseman are also represented.

The way in which these various rock engravings in northern Greece, Albania and Bulgaria, consistently seem to be assignable to the Late Bronze Age or the early part of the Iron Age offers further encouragement for the idea that the Asfendhou engravings may date from the period of the early Dorian settlement in Crete.

Another link between some of the rock engravings in Bulgaria and northern Greece, and those in the cave at Asfendhou, are the rayed discs which they share (Fig. 21). Circles like wheels with rays or other arrangements of lines through them are no doubt often correctly interpreted as symbols for the sun.

Tsountas noted a circle with four rays on a slab with cup-marks as Sesklo in Thessaly assignable it seems to the Bronze Age.³⁴ Similar rayed discs appear among the

engravings at Tsogar in Thrace, and in this region circular symbols for the sun were still being engraved on rocks well into the Iron Age. Some carved in the rock high on the acropolis at Philippi have been the subject of a careful study by Höckmann, who suggests that they were the work of Thrace-Paeonian inhabitants of the area in the sixth century B.C. (Fig. 22).³⁵ These sun-symbols at Philippi are associated with a crescent-shaped ship with a mast and stay curiously reminiscent of the ships at Asfendhou.

The engravings in the cave at Asfendhou fall into a class with miniature figures cut in faces of rock and occupying quite a small area. Other known examples of this class of rock engraving are concentrated on the northern fringes of Greece, where they seem to be assignable to the end of the Bronze Age and the beginning of the Iron Age. In some cases they can be associated with peoples known to have inhabited those areas at the dawn of history.

Their character and style make it unlikely that the Asfendhou engravings date from the time of the Minoan Bronze Age civilization of Crete. The Cretan parallels for them all point to the Iron Age. It therefore seems reasonable to assign them to the same horizon as their relatives further north, and interpret them as the work of Dorian Greek settlers, who made them not too long after their first arrival in Crete, and before they had abandoned primitive traits which they had shared with neighbouring and related peoples living on the fringes of the Mycenaean world.

If this interpretation is correct, the engravings in the cave at Asfendhou offer a rare glimpse at the religious or magical practices of the earliest Dorian Greek settlers in Crete and their expression in art.

Sinclair Hood
Great Milton
Oxford

32) V. Mikov, *Bull. de l'Institut archéologique Bulgare* v (1928/29) 291-308.

33) Ch. G. Papoutsakis, *Anthropos* i (1974) 1-12.


34) Ch. Tsountas, *Ai Proistorikai Akropoleis Dhiminiou kai Sesklou*

(Athens, 1908) 111 f. fig. 24.

35) O. Höckmann, "Eine Felszeichnung in Philippi," *Ist. Mitt.* xix (1969) 145-63.



13 Engraved slab from the "agora" in Dreros



14 Engraved stone from the temple area at Dreros




15 Stone from a cistern at Dreros




16,16a Rock engravings from Mt. Oxa




17-18 Engravings at Kastri in Euboia




19 Animals from engravings in Bulgaria



21 Rayed discs from engravings in Bulgaria



22 Rayed discs from Philippi



20 Human figures from engravings in Bulgaria

